00110769

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 09 July, 2016

AN

Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory,

ANTIENT AND MODERN,

FROM

THE BIRTH OF CHRIST,

TO THE

110769
ac

BEGINNING OF THE PRESENT CENTURY:

IN WHICH

The Riſe, Progreſs, and Variations of CHURCH POWER

ARE CONSIDERED

In their Connexion with the State of LEARNING and PHILOSOPHY,
and the POLITICAL HISTORY of EUROPE during that Period.

By the late learned

JOHN LAWRENCE MOSHEIM, D.D.

And Chancellor of the Univerſity of GOTTINGEN.

Tranſlated from the ORIGINAL LATIN,
And accompanied with NOTES and CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES,
By ARCHIBALD MACLAINE, D.D.

To the whole is added AN ACCURATE INDEX.

A NEW EDITION.

VOL. V.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR T. CADELL, IN THE STRAND.
M DCC XC.

00110769

Literary Society of Bombay

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

SECTION I.

The GENERAL HISTORY *of the* CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

The College *de propaganda fide* founded at *Rome*.

I. THE arduous attempts made by the pontifs, in the preceding century, to advance the glory and majeſty of the ſee of *Rome*, by extending the limits of the Chriſtian church, and ſpreading the goſpel through the diſtant nations, met with much oppoſition; and, as they were neither well conducted nor properly ſupported, their fruits were neither abundant nor permanent. But in this century the ſame attempts were renewed with vigour, crowned with ſucceſs, and contributed not a little to give a new degree of ſtability to the tottering grandeur of the papacy. They were begun by GREGORY XV., who, by the advice of his confeſſor NARNI, founded at *Rome*, in the year 1622, the famous *Congregation for the propagation of the faith*, and enriched it with ample revenues. This congregation, which conſiſts of thirteen cardinals, two prieſts, one monk, and a ſecretary [a], is deſigned to propagate and maintain the religion of *Rome* in all parts and corners of the world. Its riches and poſſeſſions were ſo prodigiouſly augmented by the munificence of URBAN VIII., and the liberality of an incredible number of donors, that its funds are, at this day, adequate to the moſt expenſive and magnificent undertakings. And, indeed, the enterpriſes of this *Congregation* are great and extenſive. By it a vaſt number of miſſionaries are ſent to the remoteſt parts of the world; books of various kinds publiſhed, to facilitate the ſtudy of foreign and barbarous languages; the ſacred writings and other pious productions ſent abroad to the moſt diſtant corners of the globe, and exhibited to each nation and country in their own language and characters; ſeminaries founded for the ſuſtenance and education of a prodigious number of young men, ſet apart for the foreign miſſions; houſes erected for the inſtruction and ſupport of the Pagan youths that are yearly ſent from abroad to *Rome*, that they may return from thence into their reſpective countries, and become the inſtructors of their blinded Brethren: not to mention the charitable eſtabliſhments, that are deſigned for the relief and ſupport of thoſe who have ſuffered baniſhment, or been involved in other calamities, on account of their ſtedfaſt attachment to the religion of *Rome*, and their zeal for promoting the glory of its pontif. Such are the arduous and complicated ſchemes, with the execution of which this congregation is charged; but theſe, though the principal, are not the only objects of its attention; its views, in a word, are vaſt, and its exploits almoſt incredible. Its

---

[a] Such is the number of members belonging to this *Congregation* as they ſtand in the original *Bull* of GREGORY XV.; ſee *Bullarium Roman.* tom. iii. p. 472. *edit. Luxemburg.*— CERRI mentions the ſame number, in his *Etât Preſent de l'Egliſe Romaine*, p. 259. But a different account is given by AYMON,

AYMON, in his *Tableau de la Cour de Rome*, part III. chap. iii. p. 279. for he makes this *Congregation* to conſiſt of *eighteen* cardinals, *one* of the pope's ſecretaries, *one* apoſtolical *prothonotary*, one *referendary*, and *one* of the aſſeſſors, or ſecretaries of the inquiſition.

members hold their aſſemblies in a ſplendid and magnificent palace, whoſe delightful ſituation adds a ſingular luſtre to its beauty and grandeur [*b*].

The College *pro propaganda*, &c. inſtituted by Urban VIII.

II. To this famous eſtabliſhment, another leſs magnificent indeed, but highly uſeful, was added, in the year 1627, by pope Urban VIII., under the denomination of a *College* or *Seminary for the propagation of the faith*. This ſeminary is ſet apart for the inſtruction and education of thoſe who are deſigned for the foreign miſſions; and they are here brought up, with the greateſt care, in the knowledge of all the languages and ſciences that are neceſſary to prepare them for propagating the Goſpel among the diſtant nations. This excellent foundation was due to the zeal and munificence of JOHN BAPTIST VILES, a Spaniſh nobleman, who reſided at the court of *Rome*, and who began by preſenting to the pontif all his ample poſſeſſions, together with his houſe, which was a noble and beautiful ſtructure, for this pious and generous purpoſe. His liberality excited a ſpirit of pious emulation, and is followed with zeal even to this day. The *Seminary* was at firſt committed by URBAN to the care and direction of three *canons* of the *patriarchal* churches; but this appointment was afterwards changed, and, ever ſince the year 1641, it is governed by the *Congregation* founded by GREGORY XV. [*c*].

[*b*] The authors, who have given an account of this Congregation, are mentioned by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens*, cap. xxxiii. p. 566. Add to theſe, DOROTHEUS ASCANIUS, *De Montibus Pietatis Eccleſiæ Roman.* p. 522. where there is a complete liſt of the books that have been publiſhed by this Congregation, from its firſt inſtitution until the year 1667.

[*c*] HELYOT, *Hiſtoire des Ordres Monaſtiques, Religieux et Militaires*, tom. viii. cap. xii. p. 78. URB. CERRI *Etât preſent de l'Egliſe Romaine*, p. 293. where, however, the firſt founder of this College is called, by miſtake, VIVES.

III. The

Congregations of Colleges of the ſame nature founded in *France.*

III. The ſame zealous ſpirit reached *France*, and produced there ſeveral pious foundations of a like nature. In the year 1663, the *Congregation of prieſts of the foreign miſſions* was inſtituted by royal authority, while an aſſociation of biſhops and other eccleſiaſtics found the *Pariſian Seminary for the miſſions abroad*, deſigned for the education of thoſe who were ſet apart for the propagation of Chriſtianity among the Pagan nations. From hence, apoſtolical vicars are ſtill ſent to *Siam*, *Tonquin*, *Cochin China*, and *Perſia*, biſhops to *Babylon*, and miſſionaries to other Aſiatic nations; and all theſe ſpiritual envoys are ſupported by the ample revenues and poſſeſſions of the *Congregation* and *Seminary* [*d*]. Theſe *prieſts of the foreign miſſions* [*e*], and the apoſtles they ſend into foreign countries, are almoſt perpetually involved in altercations and debates with the Jeſuits and their miſſionaries. The former are ſhocked at the methods that are ordinarily employed by the latter, in converting the Chineſe and other Aſiatics to the Chriſtian religion. And the Jeſuits, in their turn, abſolutely refuſe obedience to the orders of the *apoſtolical vicars* and *biſhops*, who receive their commiſſion from the *Congregation* above-mentioned; though this commiſſion be iſſued out with the conſent of the pope, or of the *College de propaganda fide* reſiding at *Rome.* There was alſo another religious eſtabliſhment formed in *France*, during this century, under the title of the *Congregation of the Holy Sacrament*, whoſe founder was AUTHERIUS, biſhop of *Bethlehem*, and which, in the year 1644, received an order from URBAN VIII., to have always a number of eccleſiaſtics ready to exerciſe their miniſtry among the Pagan nations, whenever they ſhould be called upon by the pope, or the *Congregation de propaganda*, for that purpoſe [*f*]. It would be endleſs to mention other aſſociations of leſs note, that were formed in ſeveral countries for promoting the cauſe of Chriſtianity among the darkened nations; as alſo the care taken by the Jeſuits, and other religious communities, to have a number of miſſionaries always ready for that purpoſe.

[*d*] See the *Gallia Chriſtiana Benedictinorum*, tom. vii. p. 1024.—HELYOT, *Hiſtoire des Ordres Monaſtiques*, tom. viii. chap. xii. p. 84.

[*e*] Theſe eccleſiaſtics are commonly called in *France*, *Meſſieurs des Miſſions Etrangeres.*

Miſſionaries multiply, more eſpecially thoſe of the Jeſuits.

IV. Theſe congregations and colleges ſent forth thoſe legions of miſſionaries, who, in this century, covered, in a manner, the whole face of the globe, and converted to the profeſſion of Chriſtianity at leaſt, if not to its temper and ſpirit, multitudes of perſons in the fierceſt and moſt barbarous nations. The religious orders, that make the greateſt figure in theſe miſſions, are the *Jeſuits*, the *Dominicans*, the *Franciſcans*, and the *Capuchins*, who, though concerned in one common cauſe, agree, nevertheleſs, very ill among themſelves, accuſing each other publicly and reciprocally, and that with the moſt bitter reproaches and invectives, of want of zeal in the ſervice of CHRIST, nay of corrupting the purity of the Chriſtian doctrine to promote their ambitious purpoſes. But none are ſo univerſally accuſed of ſiniſter views and unworthy practices, in this reſpect, as the *Jeſuits*, who are ſingularly odious in the eyes of all the other miſſionaries, and are looked upon as a very dangerous and pernicious ſet of apoſtles by a conſiderable part of the Romiſh church. Nor, indeed, can they be viewed in any other light, if the general report be true, that, inſtead of inſtructing their proſelytes in the genuine doctrines of Chriſtianity, they teach them a corrupt ſyſtem of religion and morality that ſits eaſy upon their conſciences, and is reconcileable with the indulgence of their appetites and paſſions;—that they not only tolerate, but even countenance, in theſe new converts, ſeveral profane opinions and ſuperſtitious rites and cuſtoms;—that, by commerce, carried on with the moſt rapacious avidity, and various other methods little conſiſtent with probity and candour, they have already acquired an overgrown opulence, which they augment from day to day;—that they burn with the thirſt of ambition, and are conſtantly gaping after worldly honours and prerogatives;—that they are perpetually employing the arts of adulation, and the ſeductions of bribery, to inſinuate themſelves into the friendſhip and protection of men in power;—that they are deeply involved in civil affairs, in the cabals of courts, and the intrigues of politicians;—and finally, that they frequently excite inteſtine commotions and civil wars, in thoſe ſtates and kingdoms, where their views are obſtructed or diſappointed, and refuſe obedience to the Roman pontif, and to the vicars and biſhops that bear his commiſſion. Theſe accuſations are indeed grievous, but they are perfectly well atteſted, being confirmed by the moſt ſtriking circumſtantial evidence, as well as by a prodigious number of unexceptionable witneſſes. Among theſe we may reckon many of the moſt illuſtrious and reſpectable members of the church of *Rome*, whoſe teſtimony cannot be imputed to the ſuggeſtions of envy, on the one hand, nor conſidered as the effect of temerity or ignorance on the other: ſuch are the cardinals, the members of the *Congregation de propaganda fide*, and even ſome of the popes themſelves. Theſe teſtimonies are ſupported and confirmed by glaring facts, even by the proceedings of the Jeſuits in *China*, *Abyſſinia*, *Japan*, and *India*, where they have diſhonoured the cauſe of

---

[*f*] HELYOT, *loc. cit.* cap. xiii. p. 87. 100.

Chriſtianity, and hurt the intereſt of *Rome*, in the moſt ſenſible manner by their corrupt practices [g].

The Jeſuits ill-looked upon.

V. The Jeſuits exhauſted all the reſources of their peculiar artifice and dexterity to impoſe ſilence upon their accuſers, to confound their adverſaries, and to give a ſpecious colour to their own proceedings. But all their ſtratagems were ineffectual. The court of *Rome* was informed of their odious frauds; and this information was, by no means, looked upon as groundleſs. Many circumſtances concur to prove this, and among others the conduct of the Congregation at *Rome*, by which the foreign miſſions are carried on and directed. For it is remarkable, that, during many years paſt, the Jeſuits have been much leſs employed by that Congregation, than in former times, and are alſo treated, on almoſt every occaſion, with a degree of circumſpection that manifeſtly implies ſuſpicion and diffidence. Other religious orders have evidently gained the aſcendant they formerly held; and, in the nice and critical affairs of the church, and more eſpecially in what relates to the propagation of the Goſpel in foreign parts, much more confidence is placed in the auſtere ſobriety, poverty, induſtry, and patience of the *Capuchins* and *Carmelites*, than in the opulence, artifice, genius, and fortitude of the diſciples of LOYOLA. On the other hand it is certain, that if the Jeſuits are not much truſted, they are, however, more or leſs feared; ſince neither the powerful *Congregation*, now mentioned, nor even the Roman pontifs themſelves, venture to reform all the abuſes, which they ſilently diſapprove, or openly blame, in the conduct of this inſidious order. This connivance, however involuntary, is become a matter of neceſſity. The opulence of the Jeſuits is ſo exceſſive, and their credit and influence are grown ſo extenſive and formidable, in all thoſe parts of the world that embrace the religion of *Rome*, that they carry their inſolence ſo far as to menace often the pontif on his throne, who cannot, without the utmoſt peril, oblige them to ſubmit to his orders, where they are diſpoſed to be refractory. Nay more, the deciſions of the pope are frequently ſuggeſted by this powerful ſociety, and it is only in ſuch a caſe that the ſociety treats them with unlimited reſpect. When they come from any other quarter, they are received in a very different manner by the Jeſuits, who trample upon ſome of them with impunity, and interpret others with their uſual dexterity in ſuch a manner, as to anſwer the views and promote the intereſts of their ambitious order. Such, at leaſt, are the accounts that are generally given of their proceedings; accounts which, though contradicted by them, are nevertheleſs ſupported by ſtriking and palpable evidence.

---

[g] The reader will find an ample relation of theſe facts, ſupported by a cloud of witneſſes, in the Preface to the *Hiſtoire de la Compagnie de Jeſus*, publiſhed at *Utrecht* in the year 1741.

The methods of converting practiſed by the Jeſuits procure them enemies.

VI. The riſe of theſe diſſenſions between the Jeſuits and the other Roman miſſionaries is owing to the methods of converſion uſed by the former, which are entirely different from thoſe that are employed by the latter. The crafty diſciples of LOYOLA judge it proper to attack the ſuperſtition of the *Indian* nations by artifice and ſtratagem, and to bring them only gradually, with the utmoſt caution and prudence, to the knowledge of Chriſtianity. In conſequence of this principle, they interpret and explain the ancient doctrines of Paganiſm, and alſo thoſe that CONFUCIUS taught in *China*, in ſuch a manner as to ſoften and diminiſh, at leaſt in appearance, their oppoſition to the truths of the Goſpel; and whenever they find, in any of the religious ſyſtems of the Indians, tenets or precepts that bear even the fainteſt reſemblance of certain doctrines or precepts of Chriſtianity, they employ all their dexterity and zeal to render this reſemblance more plauſible and ſtriking, and to perſuade the Indians that there is a great conformity between their ancient theology and the new religion they are exhorted to embrace. They go ſtill further; for they indulge their proſelytes in the obſervance of all their national cuſtoms and rites, except ſuch as are glaringly inconſiſtent with the genius and ſpirit of the Chriſtian worſhip. Theſe rites are modified a little by the Jeſuits, and are directed towards a different ſet of objects, ſo as to form a ſort of coalition between Paganiſm and Chriſtianity. To ſecure themſelves an aſcendant over the untutored minds of theſe ſimple Indians, they ſtudy their natural inclinations and propenſities, comply with them on all occaſions, and carefully avoid whatever may ſhock them. And as in all countries the clergy, and men of eminent learning, are ſuppoſed to have a conſiderable influence on the multitude, ſo the Jeſuits are particularly aſſiduous in courting the friendſhip of the Indian prieſts, which they obtain by various methods, in the choice of which they are far from being ſcrupulous. But the protection of men in power is the great object they principally aim at, as the ſureſt method of eſtabliſhing their authority, and extending their influence. And hence they ſtudy all the arts that can render them agreeable or uſeful to great men; hence their application to the mathematics, phyſic, poetry, to the theory of painting, ſculpture, architecture, and the other elegant arts; and hence their perſeverance in ſtudying men and manners, the intereſts of princes, and the affairs of the world, in order to prepare them for giving counſel in critical ſituations, and ſuggeſting expedients in perplexing and complicated caſes. It would be endleſs to enumerate all the circumſtances that have been complained of in the proceedings of the Jeſuits. Theſe that have been now mentioned, have ruined their credit in the eſteem of the other miſſionaries, who conſider their artful and inſidious dealings as every way unſuitable to the character and dignity of the ambaſſadors of Christ, whom it becomes to plead the cauſe of God with an honeſt ſimplicity, and an ingenuous openneſs and candour, without any mixture of diſſimulation or fraud. And, accordingly, we find the other religious orders, that are employed in the foreign miſſions, proceeding in a very different method in the exerciſe of their miniſtry. They attack openly the ſuperſtitions of the Indians, in all their connexions and in all their conſequences, and are ſtudious to remove whatever may ſeem adapted to nouriſh them. They ſhew little regard to the ancient rites and cuſtoms in uſe among the blinded nations, and little reſpect for the authority of thoſe by whom they were eſtabliſhed. They treat with a certain indifference and contempt the Pagan prieſts, grandees, and princes, and preach, without diſguiſe, the peculiar doctrines of Chriſtianity, while they attack, without heſitation or fear, the ſuperſtitions of thoſe nations they are called to convert.

Chriſtianity propagated in *India*.

VII. Theſe miſſionaries of the court of *Rome* ſpread the fame of the Chriſtian religion through the greateſt part of *Aſia* during this century. To begin with *India*; it is obſervable, that the miniſterial labours of the *Jeſuits*, *Theatins*, and *Auguſtinians* contributed to introduce ſome rays of divine truth, mixed, indeed, with much darkneſs and ſuperſtition, into thoſe parts of that vaſt region that had been poſſeſſed by the Portugueſe before their expulſion from thence by the Dutch.

But of all the miſſions that were eſtabliſhed in theſe diſtant parts of the globe, none has been more conſtantly and univerſally applauded than that of *Madura*, and none is ſaid to have produced more abundant and permanent fruit. It was undertaken and executed by ROBERT DE NOBILI [*h*], an Italian Jeſuit, who took a very ſingular method of rendering his miniſtry ſucceſsful. Conſidering, on the one hand, that the Indians beheld with an eye of prejudice and averſion all the Europeans, and, on the other, that they held in the higheſt veneration the order of *Brachmans*, as deſcended from the Gods; and that, impatient of other rulers, they paid an implicit and unlimited obedience to them alone, he aſſumed the appearance and title of a *Brachman*, that had come from a far country, and, by beſmearing his countenance and imitating that moſt auſtere and painful method of living that the *Sanianes* or Penitents obſerve, he at length perſuaded the credulous people that he was, in reality, a member of that venerable Order [*i*]. By this ſtratagem, he gained over to Chriſtianity twelve eminent Brachmans, whoſe example and influence engaged a prodigious number of the people to hear the inſtructions, and to receive the doctrine, of this famous miſſionary. On the death of ROBERT, this ſingular miſſion was for ſome time at a ſtand, and ſeemed even to be neglected [k]. But it was afterwards renewed, by the zeal and induſtry of the Portugueſe Jeſuits, and is ſtill carried on by ſeveral miſſionaries of that Order, from *France* and *Portugal*, who have inured themſelves to the terrible auſterities that were practiſed by ROBERT, and that are thus become, as it were, the appendages of that miſſion. Theſe fictitious *Brachmans*, who boldly deny their being Europeans or *Franks* [l], and only give themſelves out for inhabitants of the northern regions, are ſaid to have converted a prodigious number of Indians to Chriſtianity; and, if common report may be truſted to, the congregations they have already founded in thoſe countries grow larger and more numerous from year to year. Nor, indeed, do theſe accounts appear, in the main, unworthy of credit [m]; though we muſt not be too ready to receive,

---

[*h*] Others call this famous miſſionary ROBERT DE NOBILIBUS.

[*i*] URBAN CERRI, *Etât preſent de l'Egliſe Romaine*, p. 173. ☞ NOBILI, who was looked upon by the Jeſuits as the chief apoſtle of the Indians after FRANÇOIS XAVIER, took incredible pains to acquire a knowledge of the religion, cuſtoms, and language of *Madura*, ſufficient for the purpoſes of his miniſtry. But this was not all: for, to ſtop the mouths of his oppoſers, and particularly of thoſe who treated his character of Brachman as an impoſtor, he produced an old, dirty parchment, in which he had forged, in the ancient Indian characters, a deed, ſhewing that the Brachmans of *Rome* were of much older date than thoſe of *India*, and that the Jeſuits of *Rome* deſcended, in a direct line, from the God *Brama*. Nay, Father JOUVENCI, a learned Jeſuit, tells us, in the hiſtory of his Order, ſomething yet more remarkable; even that ROBERT DE NOBILI, when the authenticity of his ſmoaky parchment was called in queſtion by ſome Indian unbelievers, declared *upon oath*, before the aſſembly of the Brachmans

---

Brachmans of *Madura*, that he (NOBILI) derived really and truly his origin from the God *Brama*. Is it not aſtoniſhing that this Reverend Father ſhould acknowledge, is it not monſtrous that he ſhould applaud, as a piece of pious ingenuity, this deteſtable inſtance of perjury and fraud? See JOUVENCI *Hiſtoire des Jeſuites*.—NORBERT, *Memoires Hiſtoriques ſur les Miſſions des Malab.* tom. ii. p. 145.

[k] URBAN CERRI *Etât preſent de l'Egliſe Romaine*, p. 173.

[l] The Indians diſtinguiſh all the Europeans by the general denomination of *Franks*, or (as they pronounce the word) *Pranghis*.

[m] The Jeſuits ſeem to want words to expreſs the glory that has accrued to their Order from the remarkable ſucceſs and the abundant fruits of this famous miſſion, as alſo the dreadful ſufferings and hardſhips their miſſionaries have ſuſtained in the courſe of their miniſtry. See the *Lettres Curieuſes et Edifiantes ecrites des Miſſions Etrangeres*, tom. i. p. 9. 32. 46. 59.

CENT. XVII. SECT. I.

receive, as authentic and well atteſted, the relations that have been given of the intolerable hardſhips

---

50. 55. where father MARTIN obſerves (p. 9.) that this *miſſion ſurpaſſes all others*; that *each miſſionary baptizes, at leaſt, a thouſand converts every year* (p. 11.); that, nevertheleſs, *Baptiſm is not indiſcriminately adminiſtered, or granted with facility and precipitation to every one that demands it* (p. 12.); that thoſe *who preſent themſelves to be baptized, are accurately examined* until they exhibit ſufficient proofs of their ſincerity, *and are carefully inſtructed during the ſpace of four months in order to their reception*; that, *after their reception, they live like angels rather than like men*; and that the ſmalleſt appearance of *mortal ſins is ſcarcely, if ever, to be found among them.* If any one is curious enough to inquire into the cauſes that produce ſuch an uncommon degree of ſanctity among theſe new converts, the Jeſuits allege the two following; the *firſt* is modeſtly drawn from the holy lives and examples of the miſſionaries, *who* (p. 15.) *paſs their days in the greateſt auſterity, and in acts of mortification that are terrible to nature* (ſee tom. xii. p. 206. tom. xv. p. 211.): who are not allowed, for inſtance, the uſe of bread, wine, fiſh, or fleſh, but are obliged to be ſatisfied with water and vegetables, dreſſed in the moſt inſipid and diſguſting manner, and whoſe clothing, with the other circumſtances of life, are anſwerable to their miſerable diet. The *ſecond* cauſe of this unuſual appearance, alleged by the Jeſuits, is the ſituation of theſe new Chriſtians, by which they are cut off from all communication and intercourſe with the Europeans, who are ſaid to have corrupted, by their licentious manners, almoſt all the other Indian proſelytes to Chriſtianity. Add to all this, other conſiderations, which are ſcattered up and down in the *Letters* above cited, tom. i. p. 16. 17. tom. ii. p. 1. tom. iii. p. 217. tom. v. p. 2. tom. vi. p. 119. tom. ix. p. 126.—*Madura* is a ſeparate kingdom, ſituated in the midſt of the Indian *Peninſula* beyond the *Ganges* *. There is an accurate map of the territory comprehended in the miſſion of *Madura*, publiſhed by the Jeſuits in the xvth tome of the *Lettres Curieuſes et Edifiantes*, p. 60. The French Jeſuits ſet on foot, in the kingdom of *Carnate* and in the adjacent provinces, a miſſion like that of *Madura* (*Lettres Cur.* tom. v. p. 3. 240.); and, towards the concluſion of this century, other miſſionaries of the ſame Order formed an enterpriſe of the ſame nature in the dominions of the king of *Marava*

☞ * This is a miſtake. *Madura* is in the Indian *Peninſula within Ganges*, and not *beyond* it. Its principal produce is rice, which is one of the principal inſtruments made uſe of by the *rich* Jeſuits in the converſion of the *poor* Indians.

(tom.

CENT. XVII. SECT. I.

ſhips and ſufferings that have been ſuſtained by theſe *Jeſuit-Brachmans* in the cauſe of CHRIST. Many imagine, and not without good foundation, that their auſterities are, generally ſpeaking, more dreadful in appearance than in reality; and that, while they outwardly affect an extraordinary degree of ſelf-denial, they indulge themſelves privately in a free and even luxurious uſe of the creatures, have their tables delicately ſerved, and their cellars exquiſitively furniſhed, in order to refreſh themſelves after their labours.

In the kingdoms of *Siam, Tonquin,* &c.

VIII. The knowledge of Chriſtianity was firſt conveyed to the kingdoms of *Siam*, *Tong-king*, and *Kochinchina*, by a miſſion of Jeſuits, under the direction of ALEXANDER of RHODES, a native of *Avignon* [n], whoſe inſtructions were received with uncommon docility by a prodigious number of the inhabitants of theſe countries. An

---

(tom. ii. p. 1. tom. x. p. 79.). The Jeſuits themſelves however acknowledge (tom. vi. p. 3. 15. 66. 107.), that this latter eſtabliſhment ſucceeded much better than that of *Carnate*. The reaſon of this may perhaps be, that the French Jeſuits, who founded the miſſion of *Carnate*, could not endure, with ſuch conſtancy and patience, the auſtere and mortified manner of living which an inſtitution of this nature required, nor imitate the rigid ſelf-denial of the Brachmans, ſo well as the miſſionaries of *Spain* and *Portugal*.—Be that as it may, all theſe miſſions, that formerly made ſuch a noiſe in the world, were ſuſpended and abandoned, in conſequence of a papal mandate iſſued out, in the year 1744, by BENEDICT XIV. who declared his diſapprobation of the mean and perfidious methods of converting the Indians that were practiſed by the Jeſuits, and pronounced it unlawful to make uſe of frauds or inſidious artifices in extending the limits of the Chriſtian church. See NORBERT, *Memoires Hiſtoriques pour les Miſſions Orientales*, tom. i. & iv. MAMMACHIUS has given an account of this matter, and alſo publiſhed the mandate of BENEDICT, in his *Orig. et Antiq. Chriſtian.* tom. ii. p. 245. See alſo LOCKMAN's *Travels of the Jeſuits*, &c. tranſlated from the *Lettres Edifiantes*, &c. vol. i. p. 4. 9. 2d edit.

[n] See the *Writings* of ALEXANDER DE RHODES, who was undoubtedly a man of ſenſe and ſpirit, and more eſpecially his *Travels*, which were publiſhed in 4to. at *Paris*, in the years 1666 and 1682.

account of the ſucceſs of this ſpiritual expedition being brought to ALEXANDER VII. in the year 1658, determined that pontif to commit this new church to the inſpection and government of a certain number of biſhops, and choſe for this purpoſe ſome French prieſts out of the *Congregation of foreign miſſions*, to carry his orders to the riſing community, and to rule over it as his repreſentatives and vicegerents. But the Jeſuits, who can bear no ſuperiors, and ſcarcely an equal, treated theſe pious men with the greateſt indignity, loaded them with injuries and reproaches, and would not permit them to ſhare their labours, nor to partake of their glory [o]. Hence aroſe, in the court of *Rome*, a long and tedious conteſt, which ſerved to ſhew, in the plaineſt manner, that the Jeſuits were ready enough to make uſe of the authority of the pope, when it was neceſſary to promote their intereſts, or to extend their influence and dominion; but that they did not heſitate, on the other hand, to treat the ſame authority with indifference and contempt in all caſes, where it appeared in oppoſition to their private views and perſonal intereſts. After this, Lewis XIV. ſent a ſolemn embaſſy [*p*], in the year 1684, to the

---

[o] There were ſeveral Pamphlets and Memorials publiſhed at *Paris*, in the years 1666, 1674, and 1681, in which theſe French miſſionaries, whom the Jeſuits refuſed to admit as fellow-labourers in the converſion of the Indians, relate, in an eloquent and affecting ſtrain, the injuries they had received from that jealous and ambitious Order. The moſt ample and accurate narration of that kind was publiſhed at *Paris*, in the year 1688, by FRANCIS PALLU, whom the pope had created biſhop of *Heliopolis*. The ſame matter is largely treated in the *Gallia Chriſtiana* of the learned Benedictines, tom. vii. p. 1027. and a conciſe account of it is alſo given by URBAN CERRI, in his *Etât preſent de l'Egliſe Romaine*, p. 199. This latter author, though a ſecretary of the Congregation *de propaganda fide*, yet inveighs with a juſt ſeverity and a generous warmth againſt the perfidy, cruelty, and ambition of the Jeſuits, and laments it as a moſt unhappy thing, that the *Congregation*, now mentioned, has not power enough to ſet limits to the rapacity and tyranny of that arrogant ſociety. He further obſerves, towards the end of his *Narrative*, which is addreſſed to the pope, that he was not at liberty to reveal all the abominations which the Jeſuits had committed, during the courſe of this conteſt, but, by the order of his Holineſs, was obliged to paſs them over in ſilence. His words are: *Votre Sainteté a ordonneé, qu'elles demeuraſſent ſous le ſecret.*—See alſo on this ſubject, HELYOT, *Hiſtoire des Ordres Monaſtiques*, tom. viii. chap. xii. p. 84.

☞ [*p*] The French biſhops of *Heliopolis*, *Berytus*, and *Metellopolis*, that had been ſent into *India* about the year 1663, had prepared the way for this embaſſy, and by an account of the favourable diſpoſitions of the monarch, then reigning at *Siam*, had encouraged the French king to make a new attempt for the eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity in theſe diſtant regions. A fixed reſidence had been formed at *Siam* for the French miſſionaries, together with a ſeminary for inſtructing the youth in the languages of the circumjacent nations, who had all ſettlements, or *camps*, as they are called, at the capital. A church was alſo erected there, by the king's permiſſion, in the year 1667, and that prince propoſed ſeveral queſtions to the miſſionaries, which ſeemed to diſcover a propenſity to inform himſelf concerning their religion. The biſhop of *Heliopolis*, who had gone back to *Europe* on the affairs of the miſſion, returned to *Siam* in the year 1673, with letters from Lewis XIV., and Pope Clement IX., accompanied with rich preſents, to thank his Siameſe majeſty for the favours beſtowed on the French biſhops. In a private audience to which he was admitted, he explained, in anſwer to a queſtion propoſed to him by the king of *Siam*, the motive that had engaged the French biſhops to croſs ſo many ſeas, and the French king to ſend his ſubjects to countries ſo far from home, obſerving, that *a ſtrong deſire in his prince, to extend the kingdom of the true God, was the ſole reaſon of their voyage.* Upon this we are told, that the king of *Siam* offered a port in any part of his dominions, where a city might be built to the honour of Lewis the Great, and where, if he thought fit, he might ſend a viceroy to reſide; and declared afterwards, in a public aſſembly of the grandees of his court, that he would leave all his ſubjects at liberty to embrace the Romiſh faith.—All this raiſed the hopes of the miſſionaries to a very high pitch; but the expectations they derived from thence of converting the king himſelf were entirely groundleſs, as may be ſeen from a very remarkable declaration of that monarch in the following note. See the *Relation des Miſſions et des Voyages des Eveques François*, paſſim.

king of *Siam*, whoſe prime miniſter, at that time, was a Greek Chriſtian, named CONSTANTINE FAULKON, a man of an artful, ambitious, and enterpriſing ſpirit. The deſign of this embaſſy was to engage the Pagan prince to embrace Chriſtianity, and to permit the propagation of the Goſpel in his dominions. The ambaſſadors were attended by a great retinue of prieſts and Jeſuits, ſome of whom were well acquainted with thoſe branches of ſcience that were agreeable to the taſte of the king of *Siam*. It was only, however, among a ſmall part of the people, that the labours of theſe miſſionaries were crowned with any degree of ſucceſs; for the monarch himſelf, and the great men of his kingdom, remained unmoved by their exhortations, and deaf to their inſtructions [q]. The king, indeed, though he choſe to

---

☞ [q] When Monſieur DE CHAUMONT, who was charged with this famous embaſſy, arrived at *Siam*, he preſented a long memorial to the monarch of that country, intimating how ſolicitous the king of *France* was to have his *Siameſe* majeſty of the ſame religion with himſelf. CHAW NARAYA (for ſo was the latter named), who ſeems to have always deceived the French by encouraging words, which adminiſtered hopes that he never intended to accompliſh, anſwered this memorial in a very acute and artful manner. After aſking who had made the king of *France* believe that he entertained any ſuch ſentiments, he deſired his miniſter FAULKON to tell the French ambaſſador, "That he left it to his moſt Chriſtian majeſty to "judge, whether the change of a religion that had been fol- "lowed in his dominions, without interruption, for 2229 "years, could be a matter of ſmall importance to him, or a "demand with which it was eaſy to comply;—that beſides, "he was much ſurpriſed to find the king of *France* concern "himſelf ſo zealouſly and ſo warmly in a matter which relat- "ed to *God*, and not to *him*; and in which, though it related "to God, the Deity did not ſeem to meddle at all, but left it "entirely to human diſcretion." The king aſked, at the ſame time, "Whether the true God, that created heaven and "earth, and had beſtowed on mankind ſuch different natures "and inclinations, could not, when he gave to men the ſame "bodies and ſouls, have alſo, if he had pleaſed, inſpired "them

CENT. XVII. SECT. I.

to perſevere in the religion of his anceſtors, yet diſcovered a ſpirit of condeſcenſion and toleration towards the conductors of this miſſion; and his favourite CONSTANTINE had ſecretly invited the French to *Siam*, to ſupport him in his authority, which was beheld with an envious eye by ſeveral of the grandees. So that as long as this prince and his miniſter lived, the French ſtill retained ſome hopes of accompliſhing their purpoſe, and of converting the inhabitants of *Siam* to the faith. But theſe hopes entirely vaniſhed in the year 1688, when, in a popular ſedition, excited and fomented by ſome prince of the blood, both king and miniſter were put to death [r]; and then the miſſionaries returned home.

In *China*.

IX. *China*, the moſt extenſive and opulent of all the Aſiatic kingdoms, could not but appear

---

" them with the ſame religious ſentiments, and have made all " nations live and die in the ſame laws. He added, " That, ſince order among men, and unity in religion, depend " abſolutely on Divine Providence, who could as eaſily intro" duce them into the world as that diverſity of ſects that pre" vails in it, it is natural to conclude from thence, that the " true God takes as much pleaſure to be honoured by diffe" rent modes of religion and worſhip, as to be glorified by a " prodigious number of different creatures, who praiſe him " every one in his own way." He moreover aſked, " Whe" ther that beauty and variety, which we admire in the order " of nature, be leſs admirable in the order of ſupernatural " things, or leſs becoming in the wiſdom of God?—However " that be (continued the king of *Siam*) ſince we know that " God is the abſolute maſter of the world, and that we are " perſuaded nothing comes to paſs contrary to his will, I re" ſign my perſon and dominions into the arms of his provi" dence, and beſeech his eternal wiſdom to diſpoſe thereof " according to his good will and pleaſure." See TACHARD, *Prem. Voyage de Siam*, p. 218; as alſo the *Journal of the Abbé* CHOISI, who was employed in that embaſſy.

[r] An account of this embaſſy, and of the tranſactions of both ambaſſadors and miſſionaries, is given by TACHARD, CHAUMONT, and LA LOUBERT. The relations, however, of the author laſt mentioned, who was a man of learning and candour, deſerve undoubtedly the preference.

to the miſſionaries and their conſtituents an object worthy of their pious zeal and ghoſtly ambition. And accordingly a numerous tribe of *Jeſuits*, *Dominicans*, *Franciſcans*, and *Capuchins*, ſet out, about the commencement of this century, with a view to enlighten that immenſe region with the knowledge of the Goſpel. All theſe, however they differ in other matters, agree in proclaiming the aſtoniſhing ſucceſs of their miniſterial labours. It is nevertheleſs certain, that the principal honour of theſe religious exploits belongs to the Jeſuits, who, with a peculiar degree of dexterity and addreſs, removed the obſtacles that were the moſt adapted to retard the progreſs of Chriſtianity, among a people whoſe natural acuteneſs and pride were accompanied with a ſuperſtitious attachment to the religion and manners of their anceſtors. Theſe artful miſſionaries ſtudied the temper, character, taſte, inclinations, and prejudices of the Chineſe with incredible attention; and perceiving that their natural ſagacity was attended with an ardent deſire of improvement in knowledge, and that they took the higheſt pleaſure in the ſtudy of the arts and ſciences, and more eſpecially in the mathematics, they loſt no occaſion of ſending for ſuch members of their Order as, beſides their knowledge of mankind, and prudence in tranſacting buſineſs, were alſo maſters of the different branches of learning and philoſophy. Some of theſe learned Jeſuits acquired, in a very ſhort ſpace of time, ſuch a high degree of credit and influence by their ſagacity and eloquence, the inſinuating ſweetneſs and facility of their manners, and their ſurprizing dexterity and ſkill in all kinds of tranſactions and affairs, that they came at length to the knowledge of the emperor, were loaded by him with the moſt honourable marks of diſtinction, and were employed in the moſt ſecret and important deliberations and affairs of the cabinet. Under the auſpicious protection of ſuch powerful patrons, the other miſſionaries, though of a lower rank and of inferior talents, were delivered from all apprehenſion of danger in the exerciſe of their miniſtry, and thus encouraged to exert themſelves with ſpirit, vigour, and perſeverance, in the propagation of the Goſpel, in all the provinces of that mighty empire.

The progreſs of Chriſtianity in *China*.

X. This promiſing aſpect of things was clouded for ſome time, when XUN-CHI, the firſt Chineſe emperor of the Mogol race, died, and left a ſon under age as his only heir. The grandees of the empire, to whoſe tuition and care this young prince was committed, had long entertained an averſion to Chriſtianity, and only ſought for a convenient occaſion of venting their rage againſt it. This occaſion was now offered and greedily embraced. The guardians of the young prince abuſed his power to execute their vindictive purpoſes, and, after uſing their utmoſt efforts to extirpate Chriſtianity wherever it was profeſſed, they perſecuted its patrons, more eſpecially the Jeſuits, with great bitterneſs, deprived them of all the honours and advantages they had enjoyed, and treated them with the utmoſt barbarity and injuſtice. JOHN ADAM SCHAAL, their chief, whoſe advanced age and extenſive knowledge, together with the honourable place he held at court, ſeemed to demand ſome marks of exemption from the calamities that purſued his brethren, was thrown into priſon, and condemned to death, while the other miſſionaries were ſent into exile. Theſe diſmal ſcenes of perſecution were exhibited in the year 1664; but, about five years after this gloomy period, when KANG-HI aſſumed the reins of government, a new face of things appeared. The Chriſtian cauſe, and the labours of its miniſters, not only reſumed their former credit and vigour, but, in proceſs of time, gained ground, and received ſuch diſtinguiſhed marks of protection from the throne, that the Jeſuits uſually date from this period the commencement of the golden age of Chriſtianity in *China*. The new emperor, whoſe noble and generous ſpirit [*s*] was equal to the uncommon extent of his genius, and to his ardent curioſity in the inveſtigation of truth, began his reign by recalling the Jeſuits to his court, and reſtoring them to the credit and influence which they had formerly enjoyed. But his generoſity and munificence did not ſtop here; for he ſent to *Europe* for a ſtill greater number of the members of that Order, ſuch of them particularly as were eminent for their ſkill in the arts and ſciences. Some of theſe he placed in the higheſt offices of the ſtate, and employed in civil negociations and tranſactions of the greateſt importance. Others he choſe for his private friends and counſellors, who were to aſſiſt him with their advice in various matters, and to direct his philoſophical and mathematical ſtudies. Theſe private friends and counſellors were principally choſen from among the French Jeſuits. Thus the Order was raiſed, in a little time, to the very ſummit of favour, and clothed with a degree of authority and luſtre to which it had not hitherto attained. In ſuch a ſtate of things, it is but natural to conclude, that the Chriſtian religion would not want powerful patrons, nor its preachers be left deſtitute and unſupported. And accordingly a multitude of ſpiritual labourers from all parts of *Europe* repaired to *China*, allured by the proſpect of a rich, abundant, and glorious harveſt. And, indeed, the ſucceſs of their miniſtry ſeemed to anſwer fully the extent of their expectations; ſince it is well known that, with very little pains, and ſtill leſs oppoſition, they made a prodigious number of converts to the profeſſion of the Goſpel. The triumph of Chriſtianity ſeemed to be complete, when, in the year 1692, the emperor, from an exceſſive attachment to the Jeſuits, iſſued out that remarkable edict, by which he declared, that the Chriſtian religion was in no wiſe detrimental to the ſafety or intereſts of the monarchy, as its enemies pretended, and by which alſo he granted to all his ſubjects an entire freedom of conſcience, and a full permiſſion to embrace the Goſpel. This triumph was ſtill further confirmed, when the ſame prince, in the year 1700, ordered a magnificent church to be built for the Jeſuits within the precincts of the imperial palace [*t*].

[*s*] See JOACH. BOUVETI *Icon Regia Monarchæ Sinarum*, tranſlated into Latin by the famous LEIBNITZ, and publiſhed in the year 1699, in the ſecond part of his *Noviſſima Sinica*. See alſo DU HALDE's *Deſcription de la Chine*, and the *Lettres Edifiantes*, &c. in which the Jeſuits give an account of the ſucceſs of their miſſions. In theſe productions, the virtues and talents of this emperor, which ſeem indeed to be univerſally acknowledged, are deſcribed and celebrated with peculiar encomiums.

The Jeſuits accuſed of fraudulent practices.

XI. This ſurpriſing ſucceſs of the Chriſtian cauſe was undoubtedly owing to the dexterity and perſeverance of the Jeſuits, as even the greateſt enemies of that artful Order are obliged to acknowledge. But it is quite another queſtion,

---

[*t*] There is a conciſe, but intereſting account of theſe revolutions, given by DU HALDE, in his *Deſcription de la Chine*, tom. iii. p. 128. and by the Jeſuit FONTANEY, in the *Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuſes*, tom. viii. p. 176.—They are related in a more diffuſe and ample manner by other writers. See SUAREZ, *De Libertate Religionem Chriſtianam apud Sinas propagandi Narratio*, publiſhed in the year 1698, by LEIBNITZ, in the firſt part of his *Noviſſima Sinica*. The other authors who have treated this branch of hiſtory are mentioned by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toti Orbi exoriens*, cap. xxxix. p. 663. See alſo an *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of China*, which I publiſhed in German in the year 1748. ☞ This Hiſtory was tranſlated into English, and publiſhed in the year 1750, with this title: *Authentic Memoirs of the Chriſtian Church in China.*

whether this ſucceſs was obtained by methods agreeable to the dictates of reaſon and conſcience, and conſiſtent with the dignity and genius of the Chriſtian religion? This latter point has been long debated, with great animoſity and vehemence, on both ſides; and the contention is not yet ended. The adverſaries of the Jeſuits, whoſe oppoſition is as keen as their numbers are formidable, and more eſpecially the Janſeniſts and Dominicans, aſſert boldly, that the ſucceſs above mentioned was obtained by the moſt odious frauds, nay, even in many caſes, by the moſt deteſtable crimes. They charge the Jeſuits with having given a falſe expoſition and a ſpurious account of the ancient religion of the Chineſe, and with having endeavoured to perſuade the emperor and the Chineſe nobility, that the primitive theology of their nation, and the doctrine of their great inſtructor and philoſopher CONFUCIUS, differed almoſt in nothing from the doctrine of the Goſpel. They are further charged with having invented a variety of hiſtorical fictions, in order to perſuade the Chineſe (who are vehemently attached to whatever carries the air of a remote antiquity), that JESUS CHRIST had been known and worſhipped in their nation many ages ago; and theſe fictions are ſuppoſed to have prejudiced the emperor in favour of Chriſtianity, and to have engaged certain grandees of the kingdom not only to grant their protection and favour to the Jeſuits, but even to become members of their ſociety. Nor do the accuſations brought againſt the diſciples of LOYOLA end here; for they are ſaid to have entirely loſt ſight of all the duties and obligations that are incumbent on the miniſters of CHRIST, and the heralds of a ſpiritual kingdom, by not only accepting of worldly honours and places of civil authority and power, but even aſpiring after them with all the ardor

of

of an inſatiable ambition, by boaſting, with an arrogant vanity, of the protection and munificence of the emperor, by deſerting the ſimplicity of a frugal and humble appearance, and indulging themſelves in all circumſtances of external pomp and ſplendor, ſuch as coſtly garments, numerous retinues, luxurious tables, and magnificent houſes. To all which it is added, that they employed much more zeal and induſtry in the advancement of human ſcience, eſpecially the mathematics, than in promoting Chriſtian knowledge and virtue; and that they even went ſo far as to meddle in military matters, and to concern themſelves both perſonally and by their counſels in the bloody ſcenes of war. While theſe heavy crimes are laid to the charge of thoſe Jeſuits, who, by their capacity and talents, had been raiſed to a high degree of credit in the empire, the more obſcure members of that ſame Order, who were appointed more immediately to inſtruct the Chineſe in the truths of the Goſpel, are far from being conſidered as blameleſs. They are accuſed of ſpending in the practice of uſury, and in various kinds of traffic, the precious moments which ought to have been conſecrated to the functions of their miniſtry, and of uſing low and diſhonourable methods of advancing their fortunes, and inſinuating themſelves into the favour of the multitude. The Jeſuits acknowledge, that a part of theſe accuſations are founded upon facts; but they give a ſpecious colour to thoſe facts, and uſe all their artifice and eloquence to juſtify what they cannot deny. Other articles of theſe complaints they treat as groundleſs, and as the fictions of calumny, that are invented with no other deſign than to caſt a reproach upon their Order. An impartial inquirer into theſe matters will perhaps find, that if, in ſeveral points, the Jeſuits defend themſelves in a very weak and unſatisfactory

ſatisfactory manner, there are others, in which their miſconduct ſeems to have been exaggerated by envy and prejudice in the complaints of their adverſaries.

An account of the principal charge brought againſt the Jeſuits.

XII. The grand accuſation that is brought againſt the Jeſuits in *China*, is this: That they make an impious mixture of light and darkneſs, of Chineſe ſuperſtition and Chriſtian truth, in order to triumph with the greater ſpeed and facility over the prejudices of that people againſt the doctrine of the Goſpel; and that they allow their converts to retain the profane cuſtoms and the abſurd rites of their Pagan anceſtors. RICCI, who was the founder of the Chriſtian Church in that famous monarchy, declared it as his opinion, that the greateſt part of thoſe rites, which the Chineſe are obliged by the laws of their country to perform, might be innocently obſerved by the new converts. To render this opinion leſs ſhocking, he ſupported and explained it upon the following principle: that theſe rites were of a *civil* and not of a *ſacred* nature; that they were invented from views of policy, and not for any purpoſes of religion; and that none but the very dregs of the populace in *China*, conſidered them in any other light [*u*]. This opinion was not only rejected by the Dominicans and Franciſcans, who were aſſociated with the Jeſuits in this important miſſion, but alſo by ſome even of the moſt learned Jeſuits both in *China* and *Japan*, and particularly by NICHOLAS LOMBARD, who publiſhed a memorial, containing the reaſons [*v*] upon which his diſſent was founded. This conteſt, which was long carried on in a private manner, was brought, by the Dominicans, before the tribunal of the pontif, in the year 1645, and from that period continued to produce great diviſions, commotions, and caballing, in the church of *Rome*. INNOCENT X. in the year now mentioned, pronounced in favour of the Dominicans, and highly condemned the indulgence which the Jeſuits had ſhewn to the Chineſe ſuperſtitions. But, about eleven years after, this ſentence, though not formally reverſed, was neverthelefs virtually annulled by ALEXANDER VII. at the inſtigation of the Jeſuits, who perſuaded that pontiff to allow the Chineſe converts the liberty of performing ſeveral of the rites to which they had been accuſtomed, and for which they diſcovered a peculiar fondneſs. This, however, did not hinder the Dominicans from renewing their complaints in the year 1661; and again, in 1674, under the pontificate of INNOCENT XI.; though the power and credit of the Jeſuits ſeemed to triumph over all their remonſtrances. This fatal diſpute, which had been ſuſpended for ſeveral years in *China*, broke out there again, in the year 1684, with greater violence than ever; and then the victory ſeemed to incline to the ſide of the Dominicans, in conſequence of a deciſion pronounced in the year 1693, by CHARLES MAIGROT, a doctor of the Sorbonne, who acted as the delegate or vicar of the Roman pontif, in the province of *Fokien*, and who was afterwards conſecrated titular biſhop of *Conon*. This eccleſiaſtic, by a public edict, declared the opinions and practices of the Jeſuits, in relation to the affairs of the Chineſe miſſion, abſolutely inconſiſtent with the purity and ſimplicity of the Chriſtian religion.— But the pope, to whoſe ſupreme cognizance and deciſion MAIGROT had ſubmitted this important edict, refuſed to come to a determination on either ſide, before the matter in debate had been carefully examined, and the reaſons of the contending parties weighed with the utmoſt attention; and therefore, in the year 1699, he appointed a congregation of choſen doctors to examine and decide this tedious controverſy. This reſolution of the Roman pontif was no ſooner made public, than all the enemies of the Jeſuits, in all quarters of the church of *Rome*, and more eſpecially thoſe who wiſhed ill to the Order in *France*, came forth with their complaints, their accuſations, and invectives; and loaded the tranſactions and reputation of the whole ſociety with the moſt bitter reproaches [*w*]. The Jeſuits, on the other hand, were neither ſilent nor inactive. They attacked their adverſaries with vigour, and defended themſelves with dexterity and ſpirit [*x*].—But the concluſion of this critical and momentous conteſt belongs to the hiſtory of the following century.

[*u*] See MAMMACHII *Origin. et Antiquit. Chriſtian.* tom. ii. p. 373.

[*v*] See CHR. KORTHOLTI *Præfatio ad Volumen* II. *Epiſtolar. Leibnitiar.* § vi. p. 18. who has likewiſe ſubjoined to this work the pieces compoſed againſt the Jeſuits by LOMBARD and ANTHONY DE S. MARIA, with the remarks of LEIBNITZ. There is alſo inſerted in this collection (p. 413.) an ample diſſertation on the Chineſe philoſophy, drawn up by LEIBNITZ, who pleads therein the cauſe of the Jeſuits.

☞ [*w*] See the *Lettres de Meſſieurs des Miſſions Etrangeres au Pape, ſur les Idolatries et les Superſtitions Chinoiſes*—*Revocation de l'Approbation donnée en* 1787, *par M. Briſacier, Superieur des Miſſions Etrangeres, au Livre de la Defenſe des nouveaux Chretiens et des Miſſionaires de la Chine.*—*Deux Lettres d'un Docteur de l' Ordre de St. Dominique au R. P. Dez, Provincial des Jeſuits, ſur les Ceremonies de la Chine.* Theſe tracts are all printed together in one volume 12°, without any date, or name of the place where publiſhed, though the treatiſes themſelves are all dated 1700. N.

[*x*] DU HALDE, *Deſcription des la Chine*, tom. iii. p. 142.—See the enumeration of other writers on the ſame ſubject, given by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toti Orbi exoriens*, cap. xxxix. p. 665.—See alſo VOLTAIRE, *Siecle de Louis* XIV., tom. ii. p. 318.—But the moſt ingenious patron of the Jeſuits, on this occaſion was Father DANIEL, himſelf a member of that famous order: ſee his *Hiſtoire Apologetique de la Conduite des Jeſuites de la Chine*, in the third volume of his *Opuſcules*, p. 1.

The ſubject of the diſpute between the Chineſe Miſſionaries reducible to two great points:

XIII. If, in conſidering this controverſy, which employed the ableſt pens of the Romiſh church, we confine our attention to the merits of the cauſe (paſſing over what perſonally concerns the Jeſuits, with ſome other queſtions of a minute and incidental kind), it will appear, that the whole diſpute turns eſſentially upon two great points; the one relating to the *Chineſe notion* of the *Supreme Being*; and the other to the *nature* of thoſe honours, which that people offered to *certain perſons deceaſed.*

First point.

As to the firſt of theſe points, it is to be obſerved, that the Chineſe call the ſupreme object of their religious worſhip TIEN and SHANG-TI, which, in their language, ſignify the *Heavens*; and that the Jeſuits employ the ſame terms when they ſpeak of the true God, who is adored by the Chriſtians. From hence it is inferred, that they make no ſort of diſtinction between the ſupreme God of the Chineſe, and the infinitely perfect Deity of the Chriſtians; or (to expreſs the ſame thing in other words) that they imagine the Chineſe entertain the ſame notions concerning their TIEN, or *Heaven*, that the Chriſtians do concerning the God they adore. The queſtion then relative to this firſt point is properly as follows: "Do "the Chineſe underſtand, by the denominations "above-mentioned, the *viſible and material Hea-"vens?* or are theſe terms, on the contrary, em-"ployed by them to repreſent the *Lord of theſe "Heavens*, i. e. an eternal and all-perfect Being, "who preſides over univerſal nature, and, from "heaven, the immediate reſidence of his glory, "governs all things with unerring wiſdom?" or, to expreſs this queſtion in fewer words, "Do the "Chineſe mean, by their TIEN, ſuch a Diety as "the Chriſtians adore?"[a] This queſtion the Jeſuits anſwer in the affirmative. They maintain, that the ancient Chineſe philoſophers, who had an accurate knowledge of the great principles of natural religion, repreſented the Supreme Being almoſt under the very ſame characters that are attributed to him by Chriſtians; and hence they not only allow their Chineſe diſciples to employ the terms already mentioned, in their prayers to the Deity, and in their religious diſcourſe, but even uſe theſe terms themſelves, when they pronounce the name of God in their public inſtructions, or in private converſation. The adverſaries of the Jeſuits maintain the negative of this queſtion, regard the ancient philoſophy of the Chineſe as an impure ſource of blaſphemy and impiety, and affirm, that it confounded the Divine Nature with that of the univerſe. They aſſert further, that the famous Confucius, whoſe name and writings are held in ſuch veneration by the people of *China*, was totally ignorant of divine truth, deſtitute of religious principle, and traced the origin of all things that exiſt from an *internal* and *inevitable neceſſity*. This conteſt, concerning the firſt point that divided the Chineſe miſſionaries, produced a multitude of learned diſſertations on the manners, laws, and opinions of the ancient inhabitants of *China*, and gave riſe to ſeveral curious diſcoveries. But all theſe were inſufficient to ſerve the chief purpoſe they were deſigned to accompliſh, ſince they were far from giving a ſatisfactory and clear deciſion of the matter in debate. It ſtill remained a queſtion, which were moſt to be believed,—the Jeſuits or their adverſaries? and the impartial inquirer, after long examination, thought it prudent to truſt entirely to neither; ſince if it appeared on the one hand, that the Tien, or ſupreme God of the Chineſe, was much inferior, in perfection and excellence, to the God of the Chriſtians, it was equally evident, on the other, that this Chineſe Deity was looked upon by his worſhippers as entirely diſtinct from the material ÆTHER and the viſible Heavens.

Second point.

XIV. As to the other great point in diſpute, it muſt be previouſly obſerved, that the ancient laws of *China* oblige the natives of that vaſt region to perform, annually, at a ſtated time, in honour of their anceſtors, certain rites, which ſeem to be of a religious nature. It is to be obſerved further, that it is a cuſtom among the learned to pay likewiſe, at ſtated times, to the memory of CONFUCIUS, whom the Chineſe conſider as the oracle of all wiſdom and knowledge, certain marks of veneration that have undoubtedly a religious aſpect, and that are, moreover, performed in a kind of temples erected to that great and illuſtrious philoſopher. Hence then ariſeth a ſecond queſtion, which is thus propoſed: "Are thoſe honours that the Chineſe, in "general, pay to the memory of their anceſtors, "and which the learned, in particular, offer at "the ſhrine of CONFUCIUS, of a *civil* or *ſacred* na-"ture? Are they to be conſidered as *religious* "*offerings*, or are they no more than *political inſti-*"*tutions* deſigned to promote ſome public good?" The Jeſuits affirm, that the ancient Chineſe lawgivers eſtabliſhed theſe rites with no other view than to keep the people in order, and to maintain the tranquillity of the ſtate; and that the Chineſe did not pay any religious worſhip either to the memory of CONFUCIUS, or to the departed ſouls of their anceſtors, but only declared, by the performance of certain rites, their gratitude and reſpect to both, and their ſolemn reſolution to imitate their virtues and follow their illuſtrious examples. From hence theſe miſſionaries conclude, that the Chineſe converts to Chriſtianity might be permitted to perform theſe ceremonies according to the ancient cuſtom of their country, provided they underſtood their true nature, and kept always in remembrance the political views with which they were inſtituted, and the civil purpoſes they were deſigned to ſerve. By this ſpecious account of things, the conduct of the Jeſuits is, in ſome meaſure, juſtified. But let this repreſentation be true or falſe, it will ſtill remain evident, that, in order to render the Chriſtian cauſe triumphant in *China*, ſome ſuch conceſſions and accommodations as thoſe of the Jeſuits ſeem almoſt abſolutely neceſſary; and they who deſire the *end*, muſt ſubmit to the uſe of the *means* [y]. The neceſſity of theſe conceſſions ariſes from this remarkable circumſtance, that by a ſolemn law, of ancient date, it is poſitively declared, that no man ſhall be eſteemed a good citizen, or be looked upon as qualified to hold any public office in the ſtate, who neglects the obſervance of the rites and ceremonies now under conſideration. On the other hand, the Dominicans, and the other adverſaries of the Jeſuits, maintain, that the rites in queſtion form an important branch of the Chineſe religion; that the honours paid by the Chineſe to CONFUCIUS, and to the ſouls of their anceſtors, are not of a civil, but of a religious nature [z]; and conſequently, that all who perform theſe

---

☞ [y] True: if the *means* be not either criminal in themſelves, pernicious in their conſequences, or of ſuch a nature as to defeat, in a great meaſure, the benefits and advantages propoſed by the *end*. And it is a very nice and momentous queſtion, whether the conceſſions pleaded for in behalf of the Chineſe converts, by the Jeſuits, are not to be ranked among the means here characteriſed. See the following note.

☞ [z] The public honours paid to CONFUCIUS twice a year, uſed to be performed before his ſtatue, erected in the great hall or temple that is dedicated to his memory. At preſent they are performed before a kind of *Tablet*, placed in the moſt conſpicuous part of the edifice, with the following inſcription: *The Throne of the Soul of the moſt Holy and the moſt Excellent Chief-teacher* CONFUCIUS. The *literati*, or learned, celebrate this famous feſtival in the following manner:—The chief theſe rites are chargeable with inſulting the majeſty of God, to whom alone all divine worſhip is due, and cannot be looked upon as true Chriſtians.

chief mandarin of the place exerciſes the office of prieſt, and the others diſcharge the functions of deacons, ſub-deacons, and ſo on. A certain ſacrifice, called CI, which conſiſts of wine, blood, fruits, &c. is offered, after the worſhippers have prepared themſelves for this ceremony by faſting and other acts of abſtinence and mortification. They kneel before the *inſcription*, proſtrate the body nine times before it, until the head touches the ground, repeat a great variety of prayers; after which the prieſt, taking in one hand a cup full of wine, and in the other a like cup filled with blood, makes a ſolemn libation to the deceaſed, and diſmiſſes the aſſembly with a bleſſing. The rites performed by families, in honour of their deceaſed parents, are pretty much of the ſame nature.

Now in order to know, with certainty, whether this feſtival and theſe rites be of a *civil* or *religious* nature, we have only to inquire, whether they be the ſame with thoſe ceremonies that are performed by the Chineſe, in the worſhip they pay to certain celeſtial and terreſtrial *ſpirits* or *genii*, which worſhip is undoubtedly of a religious kind. The learned LEIBNITZ* undertook to affirm, that the ſervices now mentioned were not of the ſame kind, and, conſequently, that the Jeſuits were accuſed unjuſtly. But that great man does not appear to have examined this matter with his uſual ſagacity and attention: for it is evident, from a multitude of relations every way worthy of credit, and, particularly, from the obſervations made on the Chineſe miſſions by that learned and candid Franciſcan ANTONIO DE S. MARIA †, not only that CONFUCIUS was worſhipped among the *idols*, and the *celeſtial and terreſtrial ſpirits* of the Chineſe, but that the oblations and ceremonies, obſerved in honour of him, were perfectly the ſame with thoſe that were performed as acts of worſhip to theſe *idols* and *ſpirits*. Thoſe that deſire a more ample account of this matter may conſult the following authors: BUDÆI *Annal. Hiſtor. Philoſ.* p. 287. where he treats *De ſuperſtitioſo Demortuorum apud Sinenſes Cultu.*—WOLFII *Not. ad Caſaubon.* p. 342.—NIC. CHARMOS, *Annot. ad Maigrotti Hiſtoriam Cultus Sinenſes.*—But more eſpecially ARNAUD, *Morale Pratique des Jeſuites*, tom. iii. vi. vii. and a collection of hiſtorical relations, publiſhed at *Cologn*, in 8vo, in the year 1700, under the following title: *Hiſtoria Cultus Sinenſium, ſeu varia Scripta de Cultibus Sinarum inter Vicarios Apoſtolicos, & P. P. S. I. Controverſiis.*

---

* See *Præf. Noviſſim. Sinicorum.*

† See vol. ii. *Epp. Leibnitz.*

This account of matters is ſo ſpecious and probable, and the conſequences deducible from it are ſo natural and juſt, that the more equitable and impartial among the Jeſuits have acknowledged the difficulties that attend the cauſe they maintain; and taking, at length, refuge in the plea of neceſſity, allege, that certain evils and inconveniences may be lawfully ſubmitted to, when they are requiſite in order to the attainment of extenſive, important, and ſalutary purpoſes.

The ſtate of Chriſtianity in *Japan*.

XV. The miniſterial labours of the Romiſh miſſionaries, and, more eſpecially, of the Jeſuits, were crowned in *Japan* with ſurpriſing ſucceſs, towards the commencement of this century, and made an incredible number of converts to the Chriſtian religion [a]. But this proſperous and flouriſhing

---

☞ [a] Two peculiar circumſtances contributed to facilitate the progreſs of the Romiſh religion in *Japan*. The *firſt* was the uncharitable ſeverity and cruelty of the Japaneſe prieſts or *bonzas* towards the ſick and indigent, compared with the humanity, zeal, and beneficence of the miſſionaries. Theſe *bonzas* repreſented the poor and infirm not as objects of pity, but as wretches loaded with the diſpleaſure of the Gods, and abandoned to preſent and future miſery by the judgments of heaven; and inſpired the rich with a contempt and abhorrence of them. The Chriſtian religion, therefore, which declares that poverty and afflictions are often ſurer marks of the divine favour than grandeur and proſperity, and that the tranſitory evils which the righteous endure here, ſhall be crowned with everlaſting glory and felicity hereafter, was every way proper to comfort this unhappy claſs of perſons, and could not but meet with a moſt favourable reception among them. Add to this, that the miſſionaries were conſtantly employed in providing them with food, phyſic, and habitations. A *ſecond* circumſtance that was advantageous to Chriſtianity (that is, to ſuch a form of Chriſtianity as the Popiſh miſſionaries preached in *Japan*), was a certain reſemblance or analogy between it and ſome practices and ſentiments that prevailed among the Japaneſe. Theſe Indians look for preſent and future felicity only through the merits of *Xaca Amida*, and other of their Deities, who, after a long courſe of ſevere mortifications freely undertaken, had voluntarily, alſo, put an end to their lives. They ſainted many melancholy perſons who had been guilty of ſuiflouriſhing ſtate of the church was ſomewhat interrupted by the prejudices that the prieſts and grandees of the kingdom had conceived againſt the new religion, prejudices which proved fatal, in many places, both to thoſe who embraced it, and to thoſe who taught it. The cauſe of Chriſtianity did not, however, ſuffer only from the virulence and malignity of its enemies; it was wounded in the houſe of its friends, and received, no doubt, ſome detriment from the inteſtine quarrels and contentions of thoſe to whom the care of the riſing church was committed. For the ſame ſcenes of fraternal diſcord, that had given ſuch offence in the other Indian provinces, were renewed in *Japan*, where the *Dominicans*, *Franciſcans*, and *Auguſtinians* were at perpetual variance with the *Jeſuits*. This variance produced, on both ſides, the heavieſt accuſations, and the moſt bitter reproaches. The Jeſuits were charged, by the miſſionaries of the three Orders now mentioned, with inſatiable avarice, with ſhewing an exceſſive indulgence both to the vices and ſuperſtitions of the Japaneſe, with crafty and low practices unworthy of the miniſters of CHRIST, with an ambitious thirſt after

---

cide, celebrated their memories, and implored their interceſſion and good offices. They uſed proceſſions, ſtatues, candles, and perfumes, in their worſhip; as alſo prayers for the dead, and auricular confeſſion; and had monaſteries founded for certain devout perſons of both ſexes, who lived in celibacy, ſolitude, and abſtinence: ſo that the Japaneſe religion was no bad preparation for Popery. Beſides theſe two circumſtances, another may be mentioned, which we take from the letters of the Jeſuits themſelves, who inform us, that the maritime princes of *Japan* were ſo fond of this new commerce with the Portugueſe, that they ſtrove who ſhould oblige them moſt, and encouraged the miſſionaries, leſs perhaps from a principle of zeal, than from views of intereſt. See VARENIUS, *Deſcript. Japon.* lib. iii. cap. vi. x. *Modern Univ. Hiſtory*, vol. ix. p. 24. edit. 8vo.

authority and dominion; and other miſdemeanours of a like nature. Theſe accuſations were not only exhibited at the court of *Rome*, but were ſpread abroad in every part of *Chriſtendom*. The diſciples of LOYOLA were by no means ſilent under theſe reproaches; but, in their turn, charged their accuſers with imprudence, ignorance of the world, obſtinacy, aſperity of manners, and a diſguſting ruſticity in their way of living, adding, that theſe circumſtances rendered their miniſtry rather detrimental than advantageous to the cauſe of Chriſtianity, among a people remarkable for their penetration, generoſity, and magnificence. Such then were the conteſts that aroſe among the miſſionaries in *Japan*; and nothing but the amazing progreſs that Chriſtianity had already made, and the immenſe multitude of thoſe that had embraced it, could have prevented theſe conteſts from being fatal to its intereſts. As the caſe ſtood, neither the cauſe of the Goſpel, nor its numerous profeſſors, received any eſſential damage from theſe diviſions; and, if no other circumſtance had intervened to ſtop its progreſs, an expedient might have probably been found out, either to heal theſe diviſions, or, at leaſt, to appeaſe them ſo far as to prevent their noxious and fatal conſequences [b].

Its downfal and extirpation there.

XVI. But a new and dreadful ſcene of oppoſition aroſe, in the year 1615, to blaſt the hopes of thoſe who wiſhed well to the cauſe of Chriſtianity in *Japan*. For, in that year, the emperor iſſued out, againſt the profeſſors and miniſters of that divine religion, a perſecuting edict, which was executed with a degree of barbarity unparalleled in the annals of the Chriſtian hiſtory. This

[b] See the writers on this ſubject enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toti Orbi exoriens*, p. 678. as alſo CHARLEVOIX, *Hiſtoire de Japon*, tom. ii. livr. xi. p. 57.

cruel perſecution raged, during the ſpace of many years, with unrelenting fury, and only ended with the total extinction of Chriſtianity throughout that mighty empire. That religion, which had been ſuffered to make ſuch a rapid and triumphant progreſs in *Japan*, was at length conſidered as detrimental to the intereſts of the monarchy, inconſiſtent with the good of the people, derogatory from the majeſty of their high prieſt, whom they revered as a perſon deſcended from the Gods, and, on theſe accounts, was judged unworthy not only of protection, but even of toleration. This judgment was followed with the fatal Order, by which all foreigners, that were Chriſtians, and more eſpecially the Spaniſh and Portugueſe, were commanded to depart the kingdom; and the natives, who had embraced the Goſpel, to renounce the name and doctrine of CHRIST, on pain of death preſented to them in the moſt dreadful forms. This tremendous Order was the ſignal for the perpetration of ſuch horrors as the moſt ſanguine and atrocious imagination will ſcarcely be able to conceive. Innumerable multitudes of the Japaneſe Chriſtians of each ſex, and of all ages, ranks, and ſtations, expired, with magnanimous conſtancy, amidſt the moſt dreadful torments, rather than apoſtatize from the faith they had embraced. And here it may not be amiſs to obſerve, that both the Jeſuits and their adverſaries in the miſſions expiated, in ſome meaſure, if I may ſo expreſs myſelf, by the agonies they endured, and the fortitude with which they ſuffered, the faults they had committed in the exerciſe of their miniſtry. For it is well known, that the greateſt part of them died magnanimouſly for the cauſe of CHRIST by the hands of the executioner, and that ſome of them even expired with triumphant feelings of ſatisfaction and joy.

Hiſtorians are not entirely agreed with reſpect to the real cauſes of this mercileſs perſecution. The Jeſuits conſider it as owing, in part, to the imprudence of the Dominicans and Franciſcans; while theſe latter impute it, in a great meaſure, to the covetous, arrogant, and factious ſpirit of the Jeſuits [*c*]. Both parties accuſe the Engliſh and Dutch of having excited in the emperor of *Japan* a ſtrong prejudice againſt the Spaniards, Portugueſe, and the Roman pontif, to the end that they alone might engroſs the commerce of that vaſt monarchy, and be unrivalled in their credit among that powerful people. The Engliſh and Dutch allege, on the other hand, that they never attempted to undermine, by any falſe accuſations, the credit of the Roman-catholics in that kingdom, but only detected the perfidious plots the Spaniards had laid againſt it. Almoſt all the hiſtorians, who have given accounts of this country, unanimouſly inform us, that certain letters, intercepted by the Dutch, and other circumſtances of a very ſtriking and alarming kind, had perſuaded the emperor, that the Jeſuits, as alſo the other miſſionaries, had formed ſeditious deſigns againſt his government, and aimed at nothing leſs than exciting their numerous diſciples to rebellion, with a view to reduce the kingdom of *Japan* under the dominion of *Spain* [d]. A diſcovery of this nature could not but make the moſt dreadful impreſſions upon a prince naturally ſuſpicious and cruel, ſuch as the emperor then reigning was; and indeed ſo it happened; for the moment he received this information, he concluded, with equal precipitation and violence, that he could not ſit ſecure on his throne, while the ſmalleſt ſpark of Chriſtianity remained unextinguiſhed in his dominions, or any of its profeſſors breathed under his government. It is from this remarkable period, that we muſt date the ſevere edict by which all Europeans are forbidden to approach the Japaneſe dominions, and in conſequence of which all the terrors of fire and ſword are employed to deſtroy whatever carries the remoteſt aſpect or ſhadow of the Chriſtian doctrine. The only exception to this univerſal law is made in favour of an handful of Dutch merchants, who are allowed to import annually a certain quantity of European commodities, and have a factory, or rather a kind of priſon, allowed them, in one of the extremities of the kingdom, where they are ſtrictly watched, and rigorouſly confined from all communication with the natives, but what is eſſentially neceſſary to the commerce they are permitted to carry on.

[*c*] There is a conciſe and ſenſible account of this tedious diſpute in the ſixth diſcourſe that is ſubjoined to the Engliſh edition of KAEMPFER'S *Hiſtory of Japan*, § iv. p. 64—75. But it will alſo be proper to ſee what is ſaid on the other ſide, by an author, who, in his long and circumſtantial narration, has not omitted any incident, however minute, that tends, in the leaſt, to diſculpate the Jeſuits, or to procure them indulgence; that author is CHARLEVOIX; ſee his *Hiſtoire Generale de Japon*, tom. ii. livr. xii. p. 136. The other hiſtorians that may be conſulted, with utility, on this ſubject, are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toti Orbi exoriens*, cap. x. p. 678. Add to theſe the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. *Menſ. Februar.* p. 723. where there is not only a hiſtory of the commencement and progreſs of Chriſtianity in *Japan*, but alſo an account of the lives and martyrdom of thoſe who firſt ſuffered for the cauſe of the Goſpel in that kingdom. See likewiſe MAMMACHII *Origines et Antiquitat. Chriſtian.* tom. ii. p. 376.

Proteſtant miſſions in *Aſia*.

XVII. The example of the Roman-catholic ſtates could not but excite a ſpirit of pious emulation in Proteſtant countries, and induce them to propagate a ſtill purer form of Chriſtianity

---

☞ [d] The diſcoveries made by the Dutch were againſt the Portugueſe, with whom they were then at war; ſo that inſtead of *Spain* our author ſhould have ſaid *Portugal*. See Kaempfer *loc. cit.* as alſo the *Univerſal Modern Hiſtory*, vol. ix. p. 145. note (z) edit. 8vo.

among thoſe unhappy nations that lay groveling in the darkneſs of paganiſm and idolatry. Accordingly the Lutherans were, on ſeveral occaſions, ſolicited by perſons of eminent merit and rank in their communion, to embark in this pious and generous undertaking. JUSTINIAN ERNEST, baron of WELLS, diſtinguiſhed himſelf by the zealous appearance he made in this good cauſe, having formed the plan of a ſociety that was to be intruſted with the propagation of the Goſpel in foreign parts, and that was to bear the name of JESUS, the divine founder of the religion they were to promote [*e*]. But ſeveral circumſtances concurred to prevent the execution of this pious deſign, among which we may reckon, principally, the peculiar ſituation of the Lutheran princes, of whom very few have either territories, forts, or ſettlements beyond the limits of *Europe*.

This was by no means the caſe with the princes and ſtates who profeſſed the Reformed religion. The Engliſh and Dutch, more eſpecially, whoſe ſhips covered the ocean, and ſailed to the moſt diſtant corners of the globe, and who, moreover, in this century, had ſent colonies to *Aſia*, *Africa*, and *America*, had abundant opportunities of ſpreading abroad the knowledge of Chriſtianity among the unenlightened nations. Nor were theſe opportunities entirely neglected, or miſimproved, notwithſtanding the reports that have generally prevailed, of their being much more zealous in engroſſing the riches of the Indians than in bringing about their converſion; though it may, perhaps, be granted, that neither of theſe nations exerted themſelves, to the extent of their power, in this ſalutary undertaking. In the year 1647, the propagation of the Goſpel in foreign parts was committed, by an act of the Engliſh parliament, to the care and inſpection of a ſociety compoſed of perſons of eminent rank and merit. The civil wars that enſued ſuſpended the execution of the plans that were laid for carrying on this ſalutary work. In the year 1661, under the reign of CHARLES II., the work was reſumed, and the ſociety re-eſtabliſhed. In the year 1701, this reſpectable ſociety received ſingular marks of protection and favour from King WILLIAM III., who enriched it with new donations and privileges [f]. Since that period, even to the preſent time, it has been diſtinguiſhed by ample marks of the munificence of the kings of *England*, and of the liberality of perſons of all ranks and orders, and has been, and continues to be, eminently uſeful in facilitating the means of inſtruction to the nations that lie in Pagan darkneſs, and more eſpecially to the Americans. Nor are the laudable efforts of the United Provinces, in the advancement and propagation of Chriſtian knowledge, to be paſſed over in ſilence; ſince they alſo are ſaid to have converted to the Goſpel a prodigious number of Indians, in the iſlands of *Ceylon* and *Formoſa*, the coaſts of *Malabar*, and other Aſiatic ſettlements, which they either had acquired by their own induſtry, or obtained by conqueſt from the Portugueſe [g]. Some hiſtorians, perhaps, may have exaggerated, in their relations, the numbers of proſelytes made by the Dutch; it is nevertheleſs moſt certain, that as ſoon as that nation had got a ſufficient footing in the *Eaſt-Indies*, they laid with wiſdom, and executed at a great expence, various ſchemes for inſtructing the natives of thoſe diſtant regions in the doctrines of the Goſpel [*h*].

[*e*] See MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. iii. p. 75. as alſo a German work of the learned ARNOLD, entitled, *Kirchen und Ketzer Hiſtorie*, part II., book xvii. c. xv. § 23. p. 1066. part III., cap. xv. § 18. p. 150.

---

[f] See HUMPHREYS's *Account of the Propagation of the Goſpel in Foreign Parts.*

[g] See *Epiſt. de Succeſſu Evangelii apud Indos Orientales ad Johan. Leuſdenium ſcriptas et Ultraject.* 1699, in 8vo. *editas.*

The African miſſions.

XVIII. The inward parts of *Africa* remain ſtill in the darkneſs of Paganiſm, as they have been hitherto inacceſſible to the moſt adventurous of the Europeans. But in the maritime provinces of that great *peninſula*, and more eſpecially in thoſe where the Portugueſe have their ſettlements, there are ſeveral diſtricts in which the religion of *Rome* has prevailed over the ſavage ſuperſtitions of that barbarous region. It is nevertheleſs acknowledged, by the more ingenuous hiſtorians, even among the Roman Catholics, who have given accounts of the African colonies, that, of the proſelytes made there to the Goſpel, a very ſmall number deſerve the denomination of Chriſtians; ſince the greateſt part of them retain the abominable ſuperſtitions of their anceſtors, and the very beſt among them diſhonour their profeſſion by various practices of a moſt vicious and corrupt nature. Any progreſs that Chriſtianity made in theſe parts muſt be chiefly attributed to the zealous labours of the Capuchin miſſionaries, who, in this century, ſuffered the moſt dreadful hardſhips and diſcouragements in their attempts to bring the fierce and ſavage Africans under the Chriſtian yoke. Theſe attempts ſucceeded ſo far, as to gain over to the profeſſion of the Goſpel the kings of *Benin* and *Awerri* [*i*], and alſo to engage the cruel and intrepid ANNA ZINGHA, queen of *Metamba*, and all her ſubjects, to embrace, in the year 1652, the Chriſtian faith [k]. The African miſſions were allotted to this auſtere Order by the court of *Rome*, and by the ſociety *de propagandâ fide*, for wiſe reaſons; ſince none were ſo proper to undertake an enterpriſe attended with ſuch dreadful hardſhips, difficulties, and perils, as a ſet of men whoſe monaſtic inſtitute had rendered familiar to them the ſevereſt acts of mortification, abſtinence, and penance, and thus prepared them for the bittereſt ſcenes of trial and adverſity. The *Capuchins* alſo ſeem to have been alone honoured with this ſacred, but arduous commiſſion; nor does it appear that the other Orders beheld, with the ſmalleſt ſentiment of envy, their dear-bought glory.

[*h*] See BRAUN's *Veritable Religion des Hollandois*, p. 71. 267, &c. This *Treatiſe*, which was publiſhed at *Amſterdam* in the year 1675, was deſigned as an anſwer to a malignant libel of one STOUP, entitled *La Religion des Hollandois*, in which that writer propoſed, to perſuade the world that the Dutch had almoſt no religion at all.

[*i*] Called by ſome *Ouverne*.

The American miſſions.

XIX. The extenſive continent of *America* ſwarms with colonies from *Spain*, *Portugal*, and *France* [l], all which profeſs the Chriſtian religion,

---

☞ [k] For a more ample account of this Queen, and her converſion, Dr. MOSHEIM refers the reader (in his note [r]) to URBAN CERRI's *Etât Preſent de l' Egliſe Romaine*, p. 222. and to the third and fourth volumes of Father LABAT's *Relation Hiſtorique de l' Afrique Occidentale*, in the former of which he tells us, there is a French tranſlation of ANT. GAVAZZI's account of *Africa*. All theſe citations are inaccurate. CERRI makes no mention of ZINGHA, nor of METAMBA; nor are they mentioned by LABAT, in any of the five volumes of his *Hiſtorical Relation*, here quoted; nor is GAVAZZI's account tranſlated in that work.—In general it may be obſerved, that the miſſions in *Africa* were greatly neglected by the Portugueſe, and that the few miſſionaries ſent thither were men abſolutely void of learning, and deſtitute almoſt of every qualification that was neceſſary to the carrying on ſuch an important undertaking. See LABAT's Preface to his *Relation Hiſtorique de l' Afrique Occidentale*; as alſo the *Modern Univerſal Hiſtory*, vol. xiv. p. 10, 11. edit. 8vo.

[l] See the authors mentioned by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii Orbem Terrarum colluſtrans*, cap. xlviii. xlix. p. 769. —There is a curſory account of the ſtate of the Romiſh religion, in that part of *America* which is poſſeſſed by the European Roman Catholics, in URBAN CERRI's *Etât Preſent de l' Egliſe Romaine*, p. 245.

as it has been disfigured by the church of *Rome.* But it is abundantly known, that theſe coloniſts, more eſpecially the *Spaniards* and *Portugueſe*, are the moſt worthleſs and profligate ſet of men that bear the Chriſtian name; and this fact is confirmed by the teſtimonies of ſeveral Roman-Catholic writers of great merit and authority, who cannot be ſuſpected of partiality in this matter. Nay, the clergy themſelves are not excepted in this general condemnation; but, as we learn from the ſame credible teſtimonies, ſurpaſs even the idolatrous natives in the ridiculous rites which they perform in the worſhip of God, as well as in the licentiouſneſs of their manners, and the enormity of the crimes they commit without reluctance. Thoſe of the ancient inhabitants of *America*, who either have ſubmitted to the European yoke, or live near their colonies, have imbibed ſome faint knowledge of the Romiſh religion from the Jeſuits, Franciſcans, and other eccleſiaſtics; but theſe feeble rays of inſtruction are totally clouded by the gloomy ſuggeſtions of their native ſuperſtition, and the corrupt influence of their barbarous cuſtoms and manners. As to thoſe Indians who live more remote from the European ſettlements, and wander about in the woods without any fixed habitation, they are abſolutely incapable either of receiving or retaining any adequate notions of the Chriſtian doctrine, unleſs they be previouſly reclaimed from that vagrant manner of life, and civilized by an intercourſe with perſons, whoſe humane and inſinuating manners are adapted to attract their love, and excite their imitation. This the Jeſuits, and other eccleſiaſtics of different Orders in the church of *Rome*, who have been ſent in later times to convert theſe wandering ſavages, have found by a conſtant and uniform experience [*m*]. Hence the former have erected cities, and founded civil ſocieties, cemented by government and laws, like the European ſtates, in ſeveral Indian provinces both in *South* and *North America*; and it is on this account that they diſcharge the double functions of magiſtrates and doctors among theſe their new ſubjects and diſciples, whoſe morals and ſentiments, it is ſaid, they endeavour to preſerve pure and uncorrupted, by permitting few or no Europeans to approach them [*n*]. Theſe arduous and difficult attempts have furniſhed to the diſciples of LOYOLA ample matter of boaſting, and a lucky occaſion of extolling the zeal, the dexterity, and induſtry of their Order. But it has appeared, from relations worthy of credit, that theſe exploits of the Jeſuits, in the internal and more inacceſſible provinces of *America*, are not ſo much carried on with a view to the propagation of Chriſtianity, as with an intention to gratify their own inſatiable avarice and boundleſs ambition. And, accordingly, they are reported to ſend yearly to the members of their Order, in *Europe*, immenſe quantities of gold, drawn from ſeveral American provinces where they have power and property, but chiefly from *Paraguay*, which belongs to them alone [*o*].

XX. The

[*m*] A great variety of facts are alleged as a proof of this, in the *Letters* in which the French Jeſuits gave their friends in *Europe* an account of the ſucceſs and fruits of their miſſion, and which are regularly publiſhed at *Paris*.

☞ [*n*] That this was by no means the only, nor even the principal reaſon of cutting off all communication between the Indians and Europeans, will appear evident from the contents of the following note:

[*o*] While Father LABAT was at *Rome*, Father TAMBURINI, at that time general of the Jeſuits, aſked him ſeveral queſtions relating to the progreſs of Chriſtianity in *America*; to which, with equal courage and candour, he gave immediately this general

Proteſtant miſſions in *America*.

XX. The cauſe of Chriſtianity was promoted with more wiſdom, and conſequently with better ſucceſs, in thoſe parts of *America* where the Engliſh formed ſettlements during this century; and, though

---

general anſwer: "that the Goſpel had made little or no real "progreſs in that country; that he had never met with one "adult perſon among the Americans who could be eſteemed a "true proſelyte to Chriſtianity; and that the miſſionaries "could ſcarcely pretend to any other exploits *(of a ſpiritual "kind)* than their having baptized ſome children at the point "of death *." He added, at the ſame time, "that, in order "to make the Americans *Chriſtians*, it was previouſly neceſ"ſary to make them *men*." This bold Dominican, who had been himſelf a miſſionary in the American iſlands, had a great mind to give TAMBURINI ſome ſeaſonable advice concerning the immenſe wealth and authority that the Jeſuits had acquired in theſe parts of the world; but the cunning old man eluded artfully this part of the converſation, and turned it upon another ſubject. LABAT gave, upon another occaſion, a ſtill greater proof of his undaunted ſpirit and preſence of mind; for when, in an audience granted him by CLEMENT XI., that pontif praiſed, in pompous terms, the induſtry and zeal of the Portugueſe and Spaniſh miſſionaries in promoting the ſalvation of the Americans, and reproached the French with inactivity and indifference in a matter of ſuch high importance, our reſolute Dominican told him plainly, "that the Spaniards "and Portugueſe boaſted of the ſucceſs of their labours with"out any ſort of foundation; ſince it was well known, that, "inſtead of *converts*, they had only made *hypocrites*, all their "diſciples among the Indians having been forced, by the "dread of puniſhment and the terrors of death, to embrace "Chriſtianity;" adding moreover, "that ſuch as had receiv"ed baptiſm continued as open and egregious idolators as "they had been before their profeſſion of Chriſtianity †." To this account we might add the relations of a whole cloud of witneſſes, whoſe teſtimonies are every way worthy of credit, and who declare unanimouſly the ſame thing. See, among others, a remarkable piece, entitled, *Memoire touchant l'Etabliſſement conſiderable des Peres Jeſuites dans les Indes d'Eſpagne*, which is ſubjoined to FREZIER's *Relation du Voyage de la Mer du Sud*, p. 577. See alſo *Voyage aux Indes Occidentales, par* FRANC. COREAL, tom. ii. p. 67. 43. and MAMMACHIUS, *Orig. et Antiquit. Chriſtian.* tom. ii. p. 337. There

* See LABAT, *Voyage en Eſpagne et en Italie*, tom. viii. p. 7.

† Id. ib. tom. viii. p. 12.

is

though it had the greateſt ignorance, ſtupidity, and indolence to conquer, made, in a little time, a conſiderable progreſs. The Engliſh *Independents*, who retired to *America* on account of their diſſention

---

is a particular account of the Jeſuits of *Paraguay* given by DON ULLOA, in his *Voyage d' Amerique*, tom. I. p. 540; but this account is partial in their favour. They are alſo zealouſly and artfully defended in an account of the miſſion of *Paraguay*, publiſhed by MURATORI in the year 1743. ☞ When Dr. MOSHEIM wrote this note, the important diſcovery that placed the ambitious, deſpotic, and rebellious proceedings of the Jeſuits in *Paraguay* in the plaineſt and moſt ſtriking light, had not been yet made. The book of MURATORI, which was publiſhed at *Venice* in the year 1743, and republiſhed in a French tranſlation at *Paris* in 1754 *, deceived, for ſome time, the over-credulous, nay, induced even the enemies of the Jeſuits to ſuſpect that their conduct at *Paraguay* was not ſo criminal as it had been repreſented. So that, notwithſtanding the accuſations that had been brought againſt theſe miſſionaries by the writers mentioned by Dr. MOSHEIM; notwithſtanding a memorial ſent to the court of *Spain* in the year 1730, by DON MARTIN DE BARUA, at that time Spaniſh governor of *Paraguay*, in which the Jeſuits are charged with the moſt ambitious projects and the moſt rebellious deſigns, repreſented as ſetting up an independent government, accuſed of carrying on a prodigious trade, and other things of that nature; and notwithſtanding the circumſtantial evidence of various known facts that ſupported theſe accuſations in the ſtrongeſt manner: notwithſtanding all this, the public was more or leſs deceived. The illuſion, however, did not laſt long. In the year 1750, the courts of *Madrid* and *Liſbon* entered into a treaty for fixing the limits of their reſpective dominions in *South-America*. The Jeſuits, who had formed an independent republic in the heart of theſe dominions, compoſed of the Indians, whom they had gained by the inſinuating ſoftneſs and affected mildneſs, humility, and generoſity of their proceedings, were much alarmed at this treaty. It was one of the fundamental laws of this new ſtate (which was founded under the maſk of a Chriſtian miſſion), that neither biſhop, governor, nor any officer, civil, military, or eccleſiaſtical, nay, nor even any individual, Spaniard or Portugueſe, ſhould be admitted into its territories, to the

* MURATORI's account of the Miſſion of *Paraguay* was tranſlated from the French edition into Engliſh, and publiſhed in 8vo in the year 1759.

diſſention from the eſtabliſhed religion of their country, claimed the honour of carrying thither the firſt rays of divine truth, and of beginning a work that has been ſince continued with ſuch pious zeal and ſuch abundant fruit; and indeed this claim is founded in juſtice. Several families of this ſect, that had been ſettled in *Holland*, re-

---

the end that the proceedings and projects of the Jeſuits might ſtill remain an impenetrable ſecret. The members of their order were alone to be inſtructed in this profound and important myſtery. The uſe of the Spaniſh language was prohibited throughout the extent of this new territory, in order to prevent more effectually all communication between the Indians and that nation. The Indians were trained to the uſe of arms, furniſhed with artillery, inſtructed in the art of war, taught to behold the Jeſuits as their ſovereigns and their Gods, and to look upon all *white* people, except the Jeſuits, as demoniacs, atheiſts, and, moreover, as their barbarous and mortal enemies. Such was the ſtate of things when, in the year 1752, the united troops of *Spain* and *Portugal* marched towards the eaſtern borders of the river *Uragai*, to make the exchanges of certain villages that had been agreed upon in the treaty above mentioned. Upon this the Jeſuits, not being ſufficiently prepared for their defence, demanded a delay of the execution of the treaty under various pretexts. This delay was granted: but as the Spaniſh General, *Gomez Freire Andrada*, perceived that theſe *Holy Fathers* employed this delay in arming the Indians, and confirming them in their rebellion, he wrote to his court, and received new orders from thence to proceed to the execution of the treaty. A war enſued between the Spaniſh and Portugueſe on one ſide, and the Indians, animated by the Jeſuits, on the other, in which the Spaniſh General loſt his life, and of which the other circumſtances are well known. This was the real and original cauſe of the diſgrace of the Jeſuits at the court of *Portugal*. Thoſe who deſire a more particular account of this matter will find it in a famous pamphlet, drawn from an authentic memorial, publiſhed by the court of *Liſbon*, and printed at the *Hague*, in the year 1758, under the following title: *La Republique des Jeſuites au Paraguay renverſée, ou Relation Authentique de la Guerre que ces Religieux ont oſé ſoutenir contre les Monarques d' Eſpagne et de Portugal en Amerique, pour y defendre les domaines dont ils avoient uſurpé le Soveraineté au Paraguay ſous pretexte de Religion.*

moved from thence into *America* [*p*] in the year 1620, in order, as they alleged, to tranſmit their doctrine pure and undefiled to future ages; and there they laid the foundations of a new ſtate [*q*]. The ſucceſs that attended this firſt emigration engaged great numbers of the people called *Puritans*, who groaned under the oppreſſion of the biſhops, and the ſeverity of a court, by which this oppreſſion was authoriſed, to follow the fortunes of theſe religious adventurers [*r*]; and this produced a ſecond emigration in the year 1629. But notwithſtanding the ſucceſs that in proceſs of time crowned this enterprize, its firſt beginnings were unpromiſing, and the coloniſts, immediately after their arrival, laboured under ſuch hardſhips and difficulties in the dreary and uncultivated wilds of this new region, that they could make but little progreſs in inſtructing the Indians: their whole zeal and induſtry being ſcarcely ſufficient to preſerve the infant ſettlement from the horrors of famine. But towards the year 1633 [*s*], things put on a better aſpect: the colony began to flouriſh, and the new-comers, among whom the Puritans MAYHEW, SHEPPARD, and ELLIOT, made an eminent figure, had the leiſure, courage, and tranquillity of mind, that were neceſſary to the execution of ſuch an important and arduous deſign. All theſe devout exiles were remarkably zealous, laborious, and ſucceſsful in the converſation of the Indians; but none acquired ſuch a ſhining reputation, in this pious career, as JOHN ELLIOT, who learned their language, into which he tranſlated the BIBLE, and other inſtructive and edifying books, gathered together the wandering ſavages, and formed them into regular congregations, inſtructed them in a manner ſuited to the dulneſs of their comprehenſion, and the meaſure of their reſpective capacities; and, by ſuch eminent diſplays of his zeal, dexterity, and indefatigable induſtry, merited, after his death, the honourable title of the *Apoſtle of the Indians* [t].

[*p*] This colony ſettled in that part of *America* that was afterwards called *New Plymouth*.

[*q*] See NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 128.—As alſo a German work, entitled, ANT. WILH. BOHM, *Engliſche Reformations Hiſtorie*, b. vi. c. v. p. 807.

[*r*] See MATHER's *Hiſtory of New England*, p. 126.—NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 208.

☞ [*s*] Dr. MOSHEIM ſays in the year 1623, but this is probably an error of the preſs; ſince it is well known, that the emigration of *Sheppard* and *Elliot* happened between 1631 and 1634.

The unexpected ſucceſs that attended theſe pious attempts towards the propagation of Chriſtian knowledge, drew the attention of the parliament and people of *England*; and the further advancement of this good cauſe appeared an object of ſufficient importance to employ the deliberations, and to claim the protection of the great council of the nation. Thus was formed that illuſtrious ſociety, which derives its title from the great purpoſe of its inſtitution, even the *Propagation of the Goſpel in foreign parts*, and which, in proportion to the increaſe of its number, influence, revenues, and prerogatives, has ſtill renewed and augmented its efforts for the inſtruction of the Pagans in all parts of the world, particularly thoſe on the American continent. It is true, that after all its efforts, much is yet to be done; but it is alſo true, and muſt be acknowledged by all that have examined theſe matters with attention and impartiality, that much has been done, and that the pious undertakings of this reſpectable ſociety have been followed with unexpected fruit. With reſpect to the province of *Pennſylvania*, which receives in its boſom, without diſtinction, perſons of all ſects and all opinions, we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak of its religious ſtate in another place. The American provinces that were taken from the Portugueſe by the Dutch, under the command of Count MAURICE of *Naſſau*, became immediately an object of the pious zeal of their new maſters, who began, with great ardour and remarkable ſucceſs, to ſpread the light of the Goſpel among the wretched inhabitants of thoſe benighted regions [*u*]. But this fair proſpect was afterwards clouded in the year 1644, when the Portugueſe recovered the territories they had loſt. As to the Dutch colony that is ſettled in *Surinam*, we cannot ſay much, having never received the ſmalleſt information of any attempts made by them to inſtruct the neighbouring Indians in the knowledge of Chriſtianity [*w*].

---

[t] HORNBECKIUS, *De Converſione Indorum et Gentil.* lib. ii. cap. xv. p. 260.—CRESCENTII MATHERI *Epiſtola de Succeſſu Evangelii apud Indos Occidentales ad Joh. Leuſdenium, Traject.* 1699, in 8vo. ☞ INCREASE MATHER'S *Letter to Leuſden* is tranſlated into Engliſh, and inſerted into COTTON MATHER'S *Life of Elliot*, p. 94. 3d London edit. and in his Hiſtory of New England, book III. p. 194. N.

The enemies of Chriſtianity in *England*.

XXI. Religion in general, and the Chriſtian religion in particular, had many enemies to encounter in this century, though their number has been ſtudiouſly diminiſhed in the accounts of ſome, and greatly exaggerated in the repreſentations of others. The Engliſh complain of the reign of CHARLES II. as the fatal period, when corruption of manners, and vice, in the moſt licentious and profligate forms, over-ran their nation, engendered a ſpirit of ſcepticiſm and infidelity, and formed a ſet of unhappy men, who employed all the wantonneſs of inconſiderate wit, all the ſallies of imagination, and even all the force of real talent and genius, to extinguiſh a ſenſe of religion in the minds of mankind. That this complaint is far from being groundleſs, appears, on the one hand, from the number of thoſe writers among the Engliſh, whoſe productions were levelled either againſt all religion, or deſigned to confine the belief of men to natural religion alone; and, on the other, from the ſtill ſuperior number of learned and ingenious treatiſes, in which the divinity, dignity, and intrinſic excellence of the Goſpel, were demonſtrated and diſplayed in the moſt ſtriking and conſpicuous manner. But nothing is more adapted to confirm the accounts that have been given of the progreſs of infidelity and licentiouſneſs at the period now under conſideration, than the famous *Lectures*, founded by that illuſtrious ornament of religion and humanity Mr. ROBERT BOYLE, who, in the year 1691, conſecrated a conſiderable part of his large fortune to the ſervice of Chriſtianity, by leaving, in his laſt will, a ſum to be diſtributed, ſucceſſively, to a number of learned divines, who were to preach, in their turns, eight ſermons every year, in defence of natural and revealed religion [*x*]. This pious and honourable taſk has been committed always to men of the moſt eminent genius and abilities, and is ſtill undertaken with zeal, and performed with remarkable dignity and ſucceſs. The diſcourſes that have been delivered in conſequence of this admirable inſtitution have been always publiſhed; and they form at this day a large and important collection, which is known throughout all *Europe*, and has done eminent ſervice to the cauſe of religion and virtue [*y*].

[*u*] JO. HENR. HOTTINGERI *Topographia Eccleſiaſtica*, p. 47.—JANICON, *Etat Preſent des Provinces Unies*, tom. i. p. 396. The ſame author gives an account of *Surinam*, and of the ſtate of religion in that colony, chap. xiv. p. 407.

[*w*] There are three churches in that ſettlement for the uſe of the coloniſts; but no attempt has been made to ſpread the knowledge of the Goſpel among the natives.

[*x*] See RICOTIER's *Preface* to his French tranſlation of Dr. CLARKE's *Diſcourſes on the Being and Attributes of God.* For an account of the pious, learned, and illuſtrious Mr. BOYLE, ſee BUDGELL's *Memoirs of the Lives and Characters of the illuſtrious Family of the* BOYLES, publiſhed in 8vo at *London*, in the year 1737.—See alſo the *Bibliotheque Britannique*, tom. xii. p. 144. ☞ But, above all, the late learned Dr. BIRCH's *Life of* BOYLE, publiſhed in 8vo in the year 1744; and that very valuable Collection of Lives, the *Biographia Britannica*, Article BOYLE (Robert) note [z]. See alſo Article HOBBES, in the ſame collection. N.

Hobbes, Rocheſter, &c.

XXII. The leader of the impious band in *England*, which, ſo early as the reign of CHARLES II., attempted to obſcure the truth, and to diſſolve the ſolemn obligations of religion, was THOMAS HOBBES of *Malmeſbury*,—a man whoſe audacious pride was accompanied with an uncommon degree of artifice and addreſs, whoſe ſagacity was ſuperior to his learning, and whoſe reputation was more owing to the ſubtilty and extent of his genius, than to any progreſs he had made either in ſacred or profane erudition [*z*]. This man, notwithſtanding the pernicious nature and tendency of his principles, had ſeveral adherents in *England*; and not only ſo, but has found, in foreign countries, more than one apologiſt, who, though they acknowledge that his ſentiments were erroneous, yet deny that he went ſuch an impious length as to introduce the diſbelief, or to overturn the worſhip of a Supreme Being [a]. But if it ſhould be granted, on the one hand, that HOBBES was not totally deſtitute of all ſenſe of a Deity, nor of all impreſſions of religion; yet it muſt be allowed, on the other, by all who peruſe his writings, with a proper degree of attention, that his tenets lead, by natural conſequences, to a contempt of religion and of divine worſhip; and that, in ſome of his productions, there are viſible marks of an extreme averſion to Chriſtianity. It has, indeed, been ſaid of him, that, being advanced in years, he returned to a better mind, and condemned publicly the opinions and tenets he had formerly entertained [b]; but how far this recantation was ſincere, we ſhall not pretend to determine, ſince the reality of his repentance has been greatly queſtioned.

[*y*] There is a complete liſt of theſe learned diſcourſes in the *Bibliotheque Angloiſe*, tom. xv. part II. p. 416.—The late Reverend Mr. GILBERT BURNET publiſhed in four volumes in 8vo, a judicious, comprehenſive, and well-digeſted *Abridgment* of ſuch of the BOYLE's *Lectures* as had been preached before the year 1737. This abridgment, which has been tranſlated into the French and German languages, comprehends the diſcourſes of *Bentley*, *Kidder*, *Williams*, *Gaſtrell*, *Harris*, *Bradford*, *Blackhall*, *Stanhope*, *Clarke*, *Hancock*, *Whiſton*, *Turner*, *Butler*, *Woodward*, *Derham*, *Ibbot*, *Long*, *J. Clarke*, *Gurdon*, *Burnet*, *Berriman*.

[*z*] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article HOBBES. WOOD's *Athenæ Oxonienſes*, vol. ii. p. 641. laſt edition.

---

[a] Among the patrons and defenders of HOBBES, we may reckon NIC. HIER. GUNDLINGIUS, in his *Obſervationes Selectæ*, tom. i. n. ii. p. 30. and in his *Gundlingiana*, p. 304. and alſo ARNOLD, in his German work entitled, *Kirchen und Ketzer Hiſtorie*, p. II. b. xvii. c. xvi. § 25. p. 1082.—Theſe writers are refuted by the learned BUDÆUS, in his *Theſes de Atheiſmo et Superſtitione*, cap. I. p. 187.

[b] This recantation of HOBBES depends upon the teſtimony of WOOD, in his *Athenæ Oxonienſes*, vol. ii. p. 646. This writer informs us, that HOBBES compoſed an apology for himſelf and his writings, in which he declared, that the opinions he had publiſhed in his *Leviathan* were by no means conformable to his real ſentiments: that he had only propoſed them as a matter of debate, to exerciſe his mind in the art of reaſoning: that, after the publication of that book, he had never maintained them either in public or in private, but had left them entirely to the judgment and deciſion of the church: more eſpecially, that the tenets, in this and his other writings, that ſeemed inconſiſtent with the doctrines concerning God and religion that are commonly received, were never delivered by him as *truths*, but propoſed as *queſtions*, that were decided by divines and eccleſiaſtical judges endued with a proper authority.—Such is the account that WOOD gives of the *apology* now under conſideration; but he does not tell us the year

The ſame thing cannot be ſaid of JOHN WILMOT, earl of ROCHESTER, who had inſulted the majeſty of God, and trampled upon the truths of religion and the obligations of morality with a profane ſort of frenzy, that far ſurpaſſed the impiety of HOBBES, but whoſe repentance and converſion were alſo as palpable as had been his folly, and much more unqueſtionable than the dubious recantation of the philoſopher of *Malmeſbury*. ROCHESTER was a man of uncommon ſagacity and penetration, of a fine genius, and an elegant taſte; but theſe natural talents were accompanied with the greateſt levity and licentiouſneſs, and the moſt impetuous propenſity to unlawful pleaſures. So that, as long as health enabled him to anſwer the demands of paſſion, his life was an uninterrupted ſcene of debauche-

---

year in which it was publiſhed, which is a proof that he himſelf had never ſeen it, nor does he inform us whether it appeared during the life of HOBBES, or after his death. As indeed it is placed in the catalogue of his writings, with a date poſterior to the year 1682, it is natural to ſuppoſe that it was not publiſhed during his life, ſince he died in the year 1679. It is, therefore, no eaſy matter to determine what ſtreſs is to be laid upon this recantation of HOBBES, or what ſentiments we are to form concerning his ſuppoſed repentance. That the *apology* under conſideration exiſts, we do not pretend to deny; but it may poſſibly have been compoſed by ſome of his friends, to diminiſh the *odium* that, it was natural to think, his licentious principles would caſt on his memory. But ſhould it be granted, that it was drawn up and publiſhed by HOBBES himſelf, even this conceſſion would contribute but little to ſave, or rather to recover, his reputation; ſince it is well known, that nothing is more common among thoſe who, by ſpreading corrupt principles and pernicious opinions, have drawn upon themſelves the juſt indignation of the public, than, like HOBBES, to deceive the world by inſidious and inſincere declarations of the ſoundneſs of their belief, and the uprightneſs of their intention. It is thus that they ſecure themſelves againſt the execution of the laws that are deſigned to fence religion, while they perſevere in their licentious ſentiments, and propagate them, wherever they can do it with ſecurity.

ry [c]. He was, however, ſo happy in the laſt years of a very ſhort life, as to ſee the extreme folly and guilt of his paſt conduct, in which ſalutary view he was greatly aſſiſted by the wiſe and pathetic reaſonings and exhortations of doctor BURNET, afterwards biſhop of *Sarum*. This conviction of his guilt produced a deep contrition and repentance, an ardent recourſe to the mercy of God, as it is manifeſted in the Goſpel of JESUS CHRIST, and a ſincere abhorrence of the offences he had committed againſt the Beſt of Beings. In theſe pious ſentiments he departed this life in the year 1686 [d].

In this liſt we may alſo place ANTHONY ASHLEY COOPER, earl of SHAFTESBURY, who died of a conſumption at *Naples* in the year 1703; not that this illuſtrious writer attacked openly and profeſſedly the Chriſtian religion, but that the moſt ſeducing ſtrokes of wit and raillery, the moſt enchanting eloquence, and the charms of a genius, in which amenity, elegance, copiouſneſs, and elevation were happily blended, rendered him one of its moſt dangerous, though ſecret enemies; nay, ſo much the more dangerous, becauſe his oppoſition was carried on under a maſk. His works have been publiſhed, and have paſſed through ſeveral editions. They are remarkable for beauty of diction, and contain very noble and ſublime ſentiments;

---

[c] See an account of his life and writings in WOOD's *Athenæ Oxonienſes*, vol. ii. p. 654.—His poetical genius is juſtly celebrated by VOLTAIRE, in his *Melanges de Literature et de Philoſophie*, chap. xxxiv. vol. iv. of his works.

[d] Biſhop BURNET has given a particular account of this laſt and very affecting ſcene of the life of this nobleman, in a pamphlet written expreſsly on that ſubject, and entitled, *Some Paſſages of the Life and Death of John Earl of Rocheſter, written, at his deſire, on his death-bed, by* GILBERT BURNET, D. D. *containing more amply their Converſations on the great Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion.*

ments; but ought to be read with the utmoſt caution, as extremely dangerous to unexperienced, youthful, and unwary minds [e]. The brutal

---

[e] His works were firſt collected and publiſhed under the title of *Characteriſtics*, in three volumes in 8vo. in the year 1711, and, ſince that time, have paſſed through ſeveral editions. See Le Clerc's account of them in his *Bibliotheque Choiſie*, tom. xxiii. The learned and ingenious Leibnitz's Critical Reflections on the Philoſophy of Lord Shaftesbury were publiſhed by Des Maizeaux, in the ſecond volume of his *Recueil des diverſes Pieces ſur la Philoſophie*, p. 245.—There are ſome writers who maintain, that this noble philoſopher has been unjuſtly charged, by the greateſt part of the clergy, with a contempt for revealed religion; and it were to be wiſhed, that the arguments they employ to vindicate him from this charge were more ſatisfactory and ſolid than they really are. But, if I am not much miſtaken, whoever peruſes his writings, and more eſpecially his famous letter concerning *Enthuſiaſm*, will be inclined to adopt the judgment that has been formed of him by the ingenious Dr. Berkley, late biſhop of *Cloyne*, in his *Alciphron, or the Minute Philoſopher*, vol. i. p. 200.—Nothing is more eaſy than to obſerve, in the writings of Lord Shaftesbury, a ſpirit of raillery, mingling itſelf with even thoſe of his reflexions upon religious ſubjects that ſeem to be delivered with the greateſt ſeriouſneſs and gravity. But, at the ſame time, this unſeemly mixture of the ſolemn and the ludicrous renders it difficult for thoſe that are not well acquainted with his manner, to know whether the man is in jeſt or in earneſt. It may alſo be added, that this author has perniciouſly endeavoured to deſtroy the influence and efficacy of ſome of the great motives that are propoſed in the Holy Scriptures to render men virtuous, by repreſenting theſe motives as mercenary, and even turning them into ridicule. He ſubſtitutes, in their place, the intrinſic excellence and beauty of virtue as the great ſource of moral obligation, and the true incentive to virtuous deeds. But however alluring this ſublime ſcheme of morals may appear to certain minds of a refined, elegant, and ingenuous turn, it is certainly little adapted to the taſte, the comprehenſion, and character of the multitude. Take away from the lower orders of mankind the proſpect of reward and puniſhment, that leads them to virtue and obedience, by the powerful ſuggeſtions of hope and fear, and the great ſupports of virtue, and the moſt effectual motives to the purſuits of it, will be then removed with reſpect to them.

☞ Since Dr. Mosheim wrote this note, the very learned and judicious Dr. Leland publiſhed his *View of the principal* tal ruſticity and uncouth turn of JOHN TOLAND, a native of *Ireland*, who, towards the concluſion of this century, was rendered infamous by ſeveral injurious libels againſt Chriſtianity, muſt naturally appear doubly diſguſting, when compared with the amiable elegance and ſpecious refinement of the writer now mentioned. However, as thoſe writers, who flatter the paſſions by endeavouring to remove all the reſtraints that religion impoſes upon their exceſſive indulgence, will never want patrons among the licentious part of mankind; ſo this man, who was not deſtitute of learning, impoſed upon the ignorant and unwary; and, notwithſtanding the exceſs of his

---

Deiſtical Writers that have appeared in England during the laſt and preſent Century, &c. in which there is a full account of the Free-thinkers and Deiſts mentioned by our hiſtorian, and a review of the writings of the Earl of SHAFTESBURY. This review merits a particular attention, as it contains an impartial account, an accurate examination, and a ſatisfactory refutation, of the erroneous principles of that great man. Lord SHAFTESBURY, like all other eminent innovators, has been miſrepreſented both by his friends and his enemies. Dr. LELAND has ſteered a middle courſe, between the blind enthuſiaſm of the former, and the partial malignity of the latter. He points out, with ſingular penetration and judgment, the errors, inconſiſtencies, and contradictions, of that illuſtrious author; does juſtice to what is good in his ingenious writings; ſeparates carefully the wheat from the chaff; and neither approves nor condemns in the lump, as too many have done. In a more particular manner he has ſhewn, with his uſual perſpicuity and good ſenſe, that the being influenced by the hope of the reward promiſed in the Goſpel has nothing in it *diſingenuous* and *ſlaviſh*, and is ſo far from being inconſiſtent with loving virtue *for its own ſake*, that it tends, on the contrary, to heighten our eſteem of its *amiableneſs* and *worth*.— The triumphant manner in which the learned Dr. WARBURTON has refuted SHAFTESBURY's repreſentation of raillery and ridicule as a teſt of truth, is too well known to be mentioned here. See alſo Dr. BROWN's *Three Eſſays on the Characteriſtics*, in which that ſenſible author treats of *Ridicule*, conſidered as a *Teſt of Truth*; of the obligations of men to virtue, and of the neceſſity of religious principle, and of revealed religion and Chriſtianity.

arrogance and vanity, and the ſhocking rudeneſs and ferocity of his manners, acquired a certain meaſure of fame [f]. It is not neceſſary to mention

---

☞ [f] Dr. Mosheim quotes here, in a ſhort note, an account he had given of the *Life and Writings of Toland*, prefixed to his confutation of the Nazarenus of that contemptible author. He alſo quotes a Life of Toland, prefixed to his poſthumous works, printed in 8vo at *London*, in 1726, by Des Maizeaux.—Dr. Mosheim ſays, that this man *was not deſtitute of learning*. Should that be granted, it muſt, nevertheleſs, be acknowledged, that this learning lay quite indigeſted in his head, and that the uſe he made of it in his works was equally injudicious and impudent. His conference with M. Beausobre concerning the *authenticity* of the Holy Scriptures, which was held at *Berlin*, in the year 1701, in preſence of the queen of *Pruſſia*, and in which he made ſuch a deſpicable figure, is a proof of the former; and his writings to all but half-ſcholars and half-thinkers will be a proof (as long as they endure) of the latter.—It is remarkable that, according to that maxim of Juvenal, *Nemo repentè fuit turpiſſimus*, Toland arrived only gradually, and by a progreſſive motion, at the ſummit of infidelity. His firſt ſtep was Socinianiſm, which appeared in his book entitled, *Chriſtianity not myſterious*. This book procured him hard treatment from the Iriſh Parliament; and was anſwered by Mr. Brown, afterwards Biſhop of *Corke*, who, unhappily, did not think good arguments ſufficient to maintain a good cauſe, unleſs they were ſeconded by the ſecular arm, whoſe ill-placed ſuccours he ſolicited with ardor. The ſecond ſtep that Toland made in the devious fields of religion was in the publication of his *Amyntor*, which, in appearance, was deſigned to vindicate what he advanced in his Life of Milton, to prove that king Charles I. was not the real author of the *Eikon Baſilike*, but, in reality, was intended to invalidate the *Canon of the New Teſtament*, and to render it uncertain and precarious. This piece, in as far as it attacked the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures, was anſwered in a triumphant manner by Dr. Clarke, in his *Reflections on that part of the Book called* Amyntor, *which relates to the writings of the Primitive Fathers*, and the *Canon of the New Teſtament*; by Mr. Richardson, in his learned and judicious *Vindication of the Canon of the New Teſtament*; and by Mr. Jones, in his *new and full Method of ſettling the Canonical Authority of the New Teſtament*. Theſe learned writers have expoſed, in the moſt ſtriking manner, the diſingenuity, the blunders, the falſe quotations, the inſidious fictions and ridiculous miſtakes of Toland, who, on various accounts, may paſs for one of the moſt harmleſs mention other authors of this claſs, who appeared in *England* during this century, but are long ſince conſigned to oblivion; the reader may, however, add to thoſe that have been already named, Lord HERBERT of CHERBURY, a philoſopher of ſome note, who, if he did not abſolutely deny the divine origin of the Goſpel [g], maintained,

---

harmleſs writers againſt the Chriſtian religion. For an account of the *Adeiſidæmon*, the *Nazarenus*, the *Letters to Serena*, the *Pantheiſticon*, and the other irreligious works of this author, with the excellent anſwers that have been made to them, ſee his Life in the *General Dictionary*, or rather in CHAUFEIPIED's Supplement to BAYLE's *Dictionary*, entitled, *Nouveau Dictionaire Hiſtorique et Critique*, as this author has not only tranſlated the articles added to BAYLE's *Dictionary* by the Engliſh editors of that work, but has augmented and improved them by ſeveral intereſting anecdotes drawn from the Literary Hiſtory of the Continent.

☞ [g] Lord HERBERT did not pretend to deny the divinity of the Goſpel; he even declared, that he had no intention to attack Chriſtianity, which he calls, in expreſs terms, the *Beſt Religion*, and which, according to his own confeſſion, tends to eſtabliſh the five great articles of that univerſal, ſufficient, and abſolutely perfect religion, which he pretends to deduce from reaſon and nature. But notwithſtanding theſe fair profeſſions, his lordſhip loſes no occaſion of throwing out inſinuations againſt all revealed religion, as abſolutely uncertain, and of little or no uſe. But this ſame deiſt, who was the firſt, and, indeed, the leaſt contemptible of that tribe in *England*, has left upon record one of the ſtrongeſt inſtances of fanaticiſm and abſurdity that perhaps ever has been heard of, and of which he himſelf was guilty. This inſtance is preſerved in a manuſcript life of Lord HERBERT, drawn up from memorials penned by himſelf, which is now in the poſſeſſion of a gentleman of diſtinction, and is as follows: That lord having finiſhed his book *De Veritate*, apprehended that he ſhould meet with much oppoſition, and was, conſequently, dubious for ſome time whether it would not be prudent to ſuppreſs it.
" Being thus doubtful, *ſays his lordſhip*, in my chamber (*at*
" *Paris, where he was ambaſſador in the year* 1624), one fair
" day in the ſummer, my caſement being open towards the
" ſouth, the ſun ſhining clear, and no wind ſtirring, I took
" my book *De Veritate* in my hands, and, kneeling on my
" knees, devoutly ſaid theſe words: *O thou Eternal God, au-*
" *thor of this light that now ſhines upon me, and giver of all in-*
" *ward*

maintained, at leaſt, that it was not eſſentially neceſſary to the ſalvation of mankind[h]; and CHARLES BLOUNT, who compoſed a book, en-

“ *ward illuminations, I do beſeech thee, of thine infinite goodneſs,* “ *to pardon a greater requeſt than a ſinner ought to make: I am* “ *not ſatisfied enough whether I ſhall publiſh this book; if it be* “ *for thy glory, I beſeech thee to give me ſome* SIGN FROM “ HEAVEN; *if not, I ſhall ſuppreſs it.*” What does the reader now think of this corner-ſtone of Deiſm, who demands a *ſupernatural revelation* from heaven in favour of a book that was deſigned to prove *all* revelation *uncertain* and *uſeleſs?* But the abſurdity does not end here, for our Deiſt not only *ſought* for this revelation, but alſo *obtained* it, if we are to believe him. Let us, at leaſt, hear him. “ I had no ſooner, *ſays he,* ſpoken theſe “ words, but a *loud,* though yet *gentle* noiſe came forth from “ the heavens (for it was like nothing on earth), which “ did ſo cheer and comfort me, that I took my petition as “ granted.” Rare credulity this in an unbeliever! but theſe gentlemen can believe even againſt reaſon, when it anſwers their purpoſe. His lordſhip continues, “ This, however “ ſtrange it may ſeem, I proteſt, before the Eternal God, is “ true; neither am I ſuperſtitiouſly deceived herein,” &c. See LELAND's *View of the Deiſtical Writers,* &c. vol. i. p. 470, &c.

[h] This is ſufficiently known to thoſe who have peruſed Lord HERBERT's book *De Cauſis Errorum,* as alſo his celebrated work *De Religione Gentilium.* This author is generally conſidered as the chief and founder of the ſect or ſociety that are called *Naturaliſts,* from their attachment to Natural Religion alone. See ARNOLDI *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtica et Hæret.* part II. p. 1083.—The peculiar tenets of this famous Deiſt have been refuted by MUSÆUS and KORTHOLT, two German divines of eminent learning and abilities.—☞ GASSENDI alſo compoſed an anſwer to Lord HERBERT's book *De Veritate.* In *England* it was refuted by Mr. RICHARD BAXTER, in a treatiſe entitled, *More Reaſons for the Chriſtian Religion, and no Reaſon againſt it.* Mr. LOCKE, in his *Eſſay on Human Underſtanding,* ſhews, with great perſpicuity and force of evidence, that the *Five Articles of Natural Religion* propoſed by this noble author are not, as he repreſents them, *Common Notices,* clearly *inſcribed* by the hand of God in the minds of *all men,* and that a Divine Revelation is neceſſary to indicate, develope, and enforce them. Dr. WHITBY has alſo treated the ſame matter amply in his learned work, entitled, *The Neceſſity and Uſefulneſs of the Chriſtian Revelation, by reaſon of the Corruptions of the Principles of Natural Religion among the Jews and Heathens,* 8vo, 1705.

titled, *The Oracles of Reaſon*, and, in the year 1693, died by his own hand [i].

Vanini, Rugger, Letzynſki, Knutzen.

XXIII. Infidelity and even Atheiſm ſhewed themſelves alſo on the continent during this century. In *France*, JULIUS CÆSAR VANINI, the author of two books, the one entitled, *The Amphitheatre of Providence* [k], and the other, *Dialogues concerning Nature* [l], was publicly burnt at *Tholouſe* in the year 1629, as an impious and obſtinate Atheiſt. It is nevertheleſs to be obſerved, that ſeveral learned and reſpectable writers conſider this unhappy man rather as a victim to bigotry and envy, than as a martyr to impiety and Atheiſm; and maintain, that neither his life nor his writings were ſo abſurd or blaſphemous as to entitle him to the character of a deſpiſer of God and religion [m]. But if VANINI had his apologiſts, this was by no means the caſe of COSMO RUGGERI, a native of *Florence*, whoſe Atheiſm was as impudent as it was impious, and who died in the moſt deſperate ſentiments of irreligion at *Paris* in the year 1615, declaring, that he looked upon all the accounts that had been given of the exiſtence of a Supreme Being and of evil ſpirits as idle dreams [n]. CASIMIR LESZYNSKI, a Poliſh knight, was capitally puniſhed, ſuffering death at *Warſaw*, in the year 1689, for denying the Being and Providence of God; but whether or no this accuſation was well founded, can only be known by reading his trial, and examining the nature and circumſtances of the evidence that was produced againſt him [o]. In *Germany*, a ſenſeleſs and frantic ſort of a man, called MATTHEW KNUTZEN, a native of *Holſtein*, attempted to found a new ſect, whoſe members, laying aſide all conſideration of *God* and *Religion*, were to follow the dictates of *reaſon* and *conſcience* alone, and from thence were to aſſume the title of *Conſcientiarians*. But this wrong-headed ſectary was eaſily obliged to abandon his extravagant undertakings; and thus his idle attempt came to nothing [*p*].

---

[i] See CHAUFFEPIED, *Nouveau Dictionaire Hiſtorique et Crit.* though this author has omitted the mention of this gentleman's unhappy fate, out of a regard, no doubt, to his illuſtrious family. ☞ Mr. CHAUFFEPIED has done no more than tranſlated the article CHARLES BLOUNT from that of the Engliſh continuators of BAYLE.

☞ [k] This book was publiſhed at *Lyons* in the year 1615, was approved by the clergy and magiſtrates of that city, and contains many things abſolutely irreconcilable with atheiſtical principles: its title is as follows: *Amphitheatrum Eternæ Providentiæ, Divino-Magicum, Chriſtiano-Phyſicum, Aſtrologico-Catholicum, adverſus Veteres Philoſophos, Atheos, Epicureos, Peripateticos, Stoicos*, &c. This book has been eſteemed innocent by ſeveral writers, impious by others, but, in our judgment, it would have eſcaped reproach, had VANINI publiſhed none of his other productions, ſince the impieties it may contain, according to the intention of its author, are carefully concealed. This is by no means the caſe of the book mentioned in the following note.

☞ [l] This book, concerning the *Secrets of Queen Nature the Goddeſs of Mortals*, was publiſhed with this ſuſpicious title at *Paris*, in the year 1616, and contains glaring marks of impiety and atheiſm; and yet it was publiſhed with the king's permiſſion, and the approbation of the *Faculty of Theology* at *Paris*. This ſcandalous negligence or ignorance is unaccountable in ſuch a reverend body. The Jeſuit GARASSE pretends that the faculty was deceived by VANINI, who ſubſtituted another treatiſe in the place of that which had been approved. See a wretched book of GARASSE, entitled, *Doctrine Curieuſe*, p. 998. as alſo DURAND, *Vie de Vanini*, p. 116.

---

[m] See BUDÆUS's *Theſes de Atheiſmo et Superſtitione*, p. 120. The author of the *Apologia pro* VANINO, which appeared in *Holland* in the year 1712, is PETER FREDERICK ARP, a learned lawyer, who, in his *Feriæ æſtivales ſeu Scriptorum ſuorum Hiſtoria*, p. 28. has promiſed a new edition of this Apology, with conſiderable additions. We may alſo place among the defenders of VANINI, the learned ELIAS FREDERICK HEISTER, in his *Apologia pro Medicis*, ſect. xviii. p. 93.

[n] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article RUGGERI.

[o] See the German work of ARNOLD, entitled *Kirchen en Ketzer Hiſtorie*, p. 1077.—There was formerly in the famous library of UFFENBACH, a complete collection of all the papers relating to the trial of LESZYNSKI, and a full account of the proceedings againſt him.

Benedict Spinoza.

XXIV. The moſt accurate and eminent of the Atheiſts of this century, whoſe ſyſtem repreſented the Supreme Author of all things as a Being bound by the eternal and immutable laws of neceſſity or fate, was BENEDICT SPINOZA, a Portugueſe Jew. This man, who died at the *Hague* in 1677, obſerved, in his conduct, the rules of wiſdom and probity, much better than many who profeſs themſelves Chriſtians, nor did he ever endeavour to pervert the ſentiments, or to corrupt the morals of thoſe with whom he lived, or to inſpire, in his diſcourſe, a contempt of religion or virtue [*q*]. It is true indeed, that, in his writings, more eſpecially in thoſe that were publiſhed after his death, he maintains openly, that *God* and the *Univerſe* are one and the ſame Being, and that all things happen by the eternal and immutable law of *nature*, i. e. of an all-comprehending and infinite Being, that exiſts and acts by an *invincible neceſſity*. This doctrine leads directly to conſequences equally impious and abſurd; for if the principle now mentioned be true, each individual is his own God, or, at leaſt, a *part* of the univerſal Deity, and is, therefore, impeccable and perfect [r]. Be that as it may, it is evident that SPINOZA was ſeduced into this monſtrous ſyſtem by the Carteſian philoſophy, of which he was a paſſionate admirer, and which was the perpetual ſubject of his meditation and ſtudy. Having adopted that general principle, about which philoſophers of all ſects are agreed; *that all realities are poſſeſſed by the Deity in the moſt eminent degree;* and having added to this principle, as equally evident, the opinion of DESCARTES, *that there are only two realities in nature, thought and extenſion, the one eſſential to ſpirit, and the other to matter* [s]; the natural conſequence of this was, that he ſhould attribute to the Deity both theſe realities, even *thought* and *extenſion*, in an eminent degree; or, in other words, ſhould repreſent them as *infinite* and *immenſe* in God. Hence the tranſition ſeemed eaſy enough to that enormous ſyſtem, which confounds *God* with the *Univerſe*, repreſents them as one and the ſame Being, and ſuppoſes only one *ſubſtance* from whence all things proceed, and into which they all return. It is natural to obſerve here, what even the friends of SPINOZA are obliged to acknowledge, that this ſyſtem is neither attended with that luminous perſpicuity, nor that force of evidence, that are proper to make proſelytes. It is too dark, too intricate, to allure men from the belief of thoſe truths relating to the Deity, which the works of nature, and the plaineſt dictates of reaſon, are perpetually enforcing upon the human mind. Accordingly, the followers of SPINOZA tell us, without heſitation, that it is rather by the ſuggeſtions of a certain *ſenſe*, than by the inveſtigations of reaſon, that his doctrine is to be comprehended; and that it is of ſuch a nature, as to be eaſily miſunderſtood

---

[*p*] See MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. i. p. 304. & *Iſagoge ad Hiſtoriam Cherſoneſ. Cimbr.* part II. cap. vi. § viii. p. 164.—LA CROZE, *Entretiens ſur divers ſujets d'Hiſtoire*, p. 400.

[*q*] The Life of SPINOZA has been accurately written by COLERUS, whoſe performance was publiſhed at the *Hague* in 8vo, in the year 1706. But a more ample and circumſtantial account of this ſingular man has been given by LENGLET DU FRESNOY, and is prefixed to BOULAINVILLIER's Expoſition of the Doctrine of SPINOZA, which was publiſhed at *Amſterdam*, under the title of *Bruſſels*, in 12mo, in the year 1731. See alſo BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article SPINOZA. ☞ LENGLET DU FRESNOY republiſhed the work of COLERUS, and added to it ſeveral anecdotes and circumſtances, borrowed from a *Life of Spinoza*, written by an infamous profligate, whoſe name was LUCAS, and who practiſed phyſic at the *Hague*. See below the notes [*x*] and [*y*].

---

[r] The learned FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Græca*, lib. v. part III. p. 119. and JENICHEN, in his *Hiſtoria Spinoziſmi Lehnhofiani*, p. 58—72. has given us an ample liſt of the writers who have refuted the ſyſtem of SPINOZA. The real opinion which this ſubtile ſophiſt entertained concerning the Deity, is to be learned in his *Ethicks*, that were publiſhed after his death, and not in his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, which was printed during his life. For in this latter *Treatiſe* he reaſons like one who was perſuaded that there exiſts an *eternal Deity*, diſtinct from *matter* and the *univerſe*, who has ſent upon earth a religion deſigned to form men to the practice of benevolence and juſtice, and has confirmed that religion by events of a *wonderful* and *aſtoniſhing*, though not of a *ſupernatural* kind. But in his *Ethicks* he throws off the maſk, explains clearly his ſentiments, and endeavours to demonſtrate, that the *Deity* is nothing more than the *univerſe*, *producing a ſeries of neceſſary movements or acts, in conſequence of its own intrinſic, immutable, and irreſiſtible energy*. This diverſity of ſentiments that appears in the different productions of SPINOZA, is a ſufficient refutation of thoſe who, forming their eſtimate of his ſyſtem from his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* alone, pronounce it leſs pernicious, and its author leſs impious, than they are generally ſuppoſed to be. But, on the other hand, how ſhall this diverſity be accounted for? Are we to ſuppoſe that SPINOZA proceeded to atheiſm by gradual ſteps, or is it rather more probable, that, during his life, he prudently concealed his real ſentiments? Which of theſe two is the caſe, it is not eaſy to determine; it appears, however, from teſtimonies every way worthy of credit, that he never, during his whole life, either made, or attempted to make, converts to irreligion; never ſaid any thing in public that tended to encourage diſreſpectful ſentiments of the Supreme Being, or of the worſhip that is due to him; nay, it is well known, on the contrary, that, when ſubjects of a religious nature were incidentally treated in the courſe of converſation where he was preſent, he always expreſſed himſelf with the utmoſt decency on the occaſion, and often with an air of piety and ſeriouſneſs that was more adapted to edify than to give offence. See DES MAIZEAUX, *Vie de M. de S. Evremond*, p. 117. tom. i. of his works. This appears alſo evident from the Letters that are publiſhed in his poſthumous works.

☞ [s] The hypotheſis of DES CARTES is not, perhaps, repreſented with ſufficient accuracy and preciſion, by ſaying that he looked upon *thought* as *eſſential to ſpirit*, and *extenſion* as *eſſential to matter;* ſince it is well known, that this philoſopher conſidered *thought* as the very *eſſence* or *ſubſtance*, of the *ſoul*; and *extenſion* as the very *eſſence* and *ſubſtance* of matter.

ſtood even by perſons of the greateſt ſagacity and penetration [t]. The diſciples of SPINOZA aſſume the denomination of Pantheiſts, chooſing rather to derive their diſtinctive title from the nature of their doctrine, than from the name of their maſter [u]. The moſt noted members of this ſtrange ſect were a phyſician, whoſe name was Lewis Meier [w], a certain perſon called Lucas,

---

[t] There is certainly no man ſo little acquainted with the character of BAYLE, as to think him void of diſcernment and ſagacity; and yet this moſt ſubtile metaphyſician has been accuſed, by the followers of SPINOZA, of miſunderſtanding and miſrepreſenting the doctrine of that Pantheiſt, and conſequently of anſwering it with very little ſolidity. See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article SPINOZA. This charge is brought againſt BAYLE, with peculiar ſeverity, by L. MEIER, in his Preface to the Poſthumous Works of SPINOZA, in which, after complaining of the miſrepreſentations that have been given of the opinions of that writer, he pretends to maintain, that his ſyſtem was, in every point, conformable to the doctrines of Chriſtianity. BOULAINVILLIERS alſo, another of SPINOZA's commentators and advocates, declares, in his preface to a book, whoſe perfidious title is mentioned below in note [y], that all the antagoniſts of that famous Jew either ignorantly miſunderſtood, or maliciouſly perverted his true doctrine; his words are: *Les Refutations de Spinoſa m'ont induit à juger, ou que leurs Auteurs n'avoient pas voulu mettre la doctrine, qu'ils combattent, dans une evidence ſuffiſante, ou qu'ils l'avoient mal entendue*, p. 153.— But now, if this be true, if the doctrine of SPINOZA be not only far beyond the comprehenſion of the vulgar, but alſo difficult to be underſtood, and liable to be miſtaken and miſrepreſented by men of the moſt acute parts and the moſt eminent abilities, what is the moſt obvious concluſion deducible from this fact? It is plainly this, that the greateſt part of the Spinoſiſts, whoſe ſect is ſuppoſed by ſome to be very numerous in *Europe*, have adopted the doctrine of that famous Atheiſt, not ſo much from a conviction of its truth founded on an examination of its intricate contents, as from the pleaſure they take in a ſyſtem that promiſes impunity to all tranſgreſſions that do not come within the cognizance of the civil law, and thus lets looſe the reins to every irregular appetite and paſſion. For it would be ſenſeleſs, in the higheſt degree, to imagine, that the pretended multitude of the Spinoſiſts, many of whom never once dreamed of exerciſing their minds in the purſuit of truth, or accuſtoming them to philoſophical diſcuſſion, ſhould all accurately comprehend a ſyſtem, which, according to their own accounts, has eſcaped the penetration and ſagacity of the greateſt geniuſes.

---

[u] Toland, unable to purchaſe himſelf a dinner, compoſed and publiſhed, in order to ſupply the ſharp demands of hunger, an infamous and impious book under the following title: *Pantheiſticon; ſive, Formulæ celebrandæ Societatis Socraticæ, in Tres Particulas diviſæ; quæ* Pantheistarum, *ſive ſodalium continent,* I. *Mores et Axiomata;* II. *Numen et Philoſophiam;* III. *Libertatem et non fallentem legem neque fallendam,* &c. The deſign of this book, which was publiſhed in 8vo at *London* in the year 1720, appears by the title. It was intended to draw a picture of the licentious morals and principles of his brethren the *Pantheiſts* under the fictitious deſcription of a *Socratical* Society, which they are repreſented as holding in all the places where they are diſperſed. In the Socratical, or rather Bacchanalian Society, deſcribed in this pernicious work, the preſident and members are ſaid to converſe freely on ſeveral ſubjects. There is alſo a *Form* or *Liturgy* read by the preſident, who officiates as prieſt, and is anſwered by the aſſembly in ſuitable *reſponſes*. He recommends earneſtly to the members of the ſociety the care of truth, liberty, and health; exhorts them to guard againſt ſuperſtition, that is religion; and reads aloud to them, by way of *Leſſon*, certain ſelect paſſages out of Cicero and Seneca which ſeem to favour irreligion. His colleagues promiſe ſolemnly to conform themſelves to his injunctions and exhortations. Sometimes the whole fraternity is ſo animated with enthuſiaſm and joy, that they all raiſe their voices together, and ſing certain verſes out of the ancient Latin poets, that are ſuitable to the laws and principles of their ſect. See Des Maizeaux, *Life of John Toland*, p. 77.—*Bibliotheque Angloiſe*, tom. viii. part II. p. 285. If the *Pantheiſtical* community be really ſuch as it is here repreſented, it is not ſo much the duty of wiſe and good men to diſpute with or refute its members, as it is the buſineſs of the civil magiſtrate to prevent ſuch licentious and turbulent ſpirits from troubling the order of ſociety, and ſeducing honeſt citizens from their religious principles, and the duties of their reſpective ſtations.

[w] This Meier was the perſon who tranſlated into Latin the pieces that Spinoza had compoſed in the Dutch language; who aſſiſted him in his laſt moments, after having attempted, in vain, to remove his diſorder; and who publiſhed his *Poſthumous Works* with a *Preface*, in which, with great impudence and little ſucceſs, he endeavours to prove, that the doctrine of Spinoza differs in nothing from that of the Goſpel. Meier

cas [x], Count Boulainvilliers [y], and ſome others, equally contemptible on account of their ſentiments and morals.

XXV. The

---

is alſo the author of a well-known treatiſe, thus entitled, *Philoſophia Scripturæ Interpres, Eleutheropoli*, 1666, in 4to, in which the merit and authority of the ſacred writings are examined by the dictates of philoſophy, that is to ſay, of the philoſophy of Mr. Meier.

[x] Lucas was a phyſician at the *Hague*, and was as famous for what he called his Quinteſſences, as he was infamous on account of the profligacy of his morals. He left behind him a *Life of Spinoza*, from whence Lenglet du Fresnoy took all the additions that he made to the Life of that Atheiſt written by Colerus. He alſo compoſed a work which is ſtill handed about and bought, at an extravagant price, by thoſe in whoſe judgment rarity and impiety are equivalent to merit. This work is entitled, *L' Eſprit de Spinoza*, and ſurpaſſes infinitely, in atheiſtical profaneneſs, even thoſe productions of Spinoza that are looked upon as the moſt pernicious; ſo far has this miſerable writer loſt ſight of every dictate of prudence, and triumphed even over the reſtraints of ſhame.

[y] This fertile and copious, but paradoxical and inconſiderate writer, is abundantly known by his various productions relating to the Hiſtory and Political State of the French Nation, by a certain prolix Fable entitled, *The Life of Mahomet*, and by the adverſe turns of fortune that purſued him. His character was ſo made up of inconſiſtencies and contradictions, that he is almoſt equally chargeable with ſuperſtition and atheiſm: for though he acknowledged no other Deity than the univerſe, or nature, yet he looked upon Mahomet as authoriſed, by a divine commiſſion, to inſtruct mankind; and he was of opinion, that the fate of nations, and the deſtiny of individuals, could be foreknown by an attentive obſervation of the ſtars. Thus the man was, at the ſame time, an atheiſt and an aſtrologer. Now this medley of a man was greatly concerned, in conſequence, forſooth, of his ardent zeal for the *public good*, to ſee the *admirable* doctrine of Spinoza ſo generally miſunderſtood, and therefore he formed the *laudable* deſign of expounding, illuſtrating, and accommodating it, as is done with reſpect to the doctrines of the Goſpel in books of piety to ordinary capacities. This deſign, indeed, he executed, but not ſo fortunately for his maſter as he might fondly imagine; ſince it appeared moſt evidently, from his own account of the ſyſtem of Spinoza, that Bayle, and the other writers who had repreſented his doctrine as repugnant to the plaineſt dictates of reaſon, and utterly deſtructive of all religion, had judged

CENT. XVII. SECT. I.

The ſciences cultivated and improved.

XXV. The progreſſive and flouriſhing ſtate of the arts and ſciences in the ſeventeenth century is abundantly known; and we ſee the effects, and enjoy the fruits, of the efforts then made for the advancement of learning. No branch of literature ſeemed to be neglected. Logic, philoſophy, hiſtory, poetry, and rhetoric; in a word, all the ſciences that belong to the reſpective provinces of reaſon, experience, obſervation, genius, memory, and imagination, were cultivated and improved

---

judged rightly, and were neither miſled by ignorance nor temerity. In ſhort, the book of BOULAINVILLIERS ſet the atheiſm and impiety of SPINOZA in a much more clear and ſtriking light than ever they had appeared before. This infamous book, which was worthy of eternal oblivion, was publiſhed by LENGLET DU FRESNOY, who, that it might be bought with avidity, and read without reluctance, prefixed to it the attracting, but perfidious, title of *A Refutation of the Errors of Spinoza;* adding indeed, to it ſome ſeparate pieces, to which this title may, in ſome meaſure, be thought applicable: the whole title runs thus: *Refutation des Erreurs de Benoit de Spinoza, par M. de Fenelon, Achevêque de Cambray, par le Pere Lami Benedictin, et par M. le Comte de Boulainvilliers, avec la Vie de Spinoſa, écrite par Jean Colerus, miniſtre de l'Egliſe Lutherienne de la Haye, augmentée de beaucoup de particularités tirées d'une Vie Manuſcripte de ce Philoſophe, fait par un de ſes Amis* (this friend was LUCAS, the atheiſtical phyſician mentioned in the preceding note) *à Bruxelles, chez François Foppens,* 1731, in 12mo. Here we ſee the poiſon and the antidote joined together, but the latter perfidiouſly diſtributed in a manner and meaſure every way inſufficient to remove the noxious effects of the former: in a word, the wolf is ſhut up with the ſheep. The account and defence of the philoſophy of SPINOZA, given by BOULAINVILLIERS under the inſidious title of a *Refutation*, takes up the greateſt part of this book, and is placed firſt, and not laſt in order, as the title would inſinuate. Beſides, the whole contents of this motley collection are not enumerated in the title; for at the end of it we find a Latin Treatiſe, entitled, *Certamen Philoſophicum propugnatæ Veritatis divinæ et naturalis, adverſus* JO. BREDENBURGII *principia, in fine annexa.* This *philoſophical controverſy* contains a Defence of the Doctrine of SPINOZA, by BREDENBURG; and a Refutation of that Defence by ISAAC OROBIO, a learned Jewiſh phyſician at *Amſterdam*, and was firſt publiſhed in 8vo in the year 1703.

with remarkable ſucceſs throughout the Chriſtian world. While the learned men of this happy period diſcovered ſuch zeal for the improvement of ſcience; their zeal was both inflamed and directed by one of the greateſt and rareſt geniuſes that ever aroſe for the inſtruction of mankind. This was FRANCIS BACON, Lord VERULAM, who, towards the commencement of this century, opened the paths that lead to true philoſophy in his admirable works [z]. It muſt be acknowledged indeed, that the rules he preſcribes, to direct the reſearches of the ſtudious, are not all practicable, amidſt the numerous prejudices and impediments to which the moſt zealous enquirers are expoſed in the purſuit of truth; and it appears plainly that this great man, to whoſe elevated and comprehenſive genius all things ſeemed eaſy, was at certain times ſo far carried away by the vaſtneſs of his conceptions, as to require from the application and abilities of men more than they were capable of performing, and to deſire the *end*, without always examining whether the *means* of attaining it were poſſible. At the ſame time it muſt be confeſſed, that a great part of the improvements in learning, and of the progreſs in ſcience that were made in *Europe*, during this century, was owing to the counſels and directions of this extraordinary man. This is more eſpecially true of the improvements that were made in natural philoſophy, to which noble ſcience

---

[z] More eſpecially in his Treatiſe *De Dignitate et Augmentis Scientiarum*, and in his *Novum Organum*. See the Life of that great man that is prefixed to the laſt edition of his Works, publiſhed by *Millar*, in four volumes *in folio*.—*Bibliotheque Britannique*, tom. xv. p. 128.—In Mr. MALLET's Life of Bacon, there is a particular and intereſting account of his noble attempt to reform the miſerable philoſophy that prevailed before his time. See alſo VOLTAIRE, *Melanges de Litterature*, &c. in the fourth volume of his Works, chap. xiv. p. 225.

BACON did ſuch important ſervice, as is alone ſufficient to render his name immortal. He opened the eyes of thoſe who had been led blindfold by the dubious authority of traditionary ſyſtems, and the uncertain directory of hypotheſis and conjecture. He led them to Nature, that they might conſult that oracle directly and near at hand, and receive her anſwers; and, by the introduction of experimental inquiry, he placed philoſophy upon a new and ſolid baſis. It was thus undoubtedly that he removed the prejudices of former times, which led men to conſider all human knowledge as circumſcribed within the bounds of Greek and Latin erudition, and an acquaintance with the more elegant and liberal arts; and thus, in the vaſt regions of nature, he opened ſcenes of inſtruction and ſcience, which, although hitherto unknown or diſregarded, were infinitely more noble and ſublime, and much more productive of ſolid nouriſhment to the minds of the wiſe, than that kind of learning that was in vogue before his time.

More eſpecially the Mathematics.

XXVI. It is remarkable, in general, that the ſciences of *natural philoſophy*, *mathematics*, and *aſtronomy*, were carried in this century, in all the nations of *Europe*, to ſuch a high degree of perfection, that they ſeemed to riſe, all of a ſudden, from the puny weakneſs of infancy to a ſtate of full maturity. There is certainly no ſort of compariſon between the philoſophers, mathematicians, and aſtronomers of the ſixteenth and ſeventeenth centuries. The former look like pigmies, when compared with the gigantic ſtature of the latter. At the head of theſe latter appears GALILEI, the ornament of natural ſcience in *Italy*, who was encouraged, in his aſtronomical reſearches and diſcoveries, by the munificence and protection of the Grand Dukes of *Tuſcany* [a]. After this aroſe in *France* Descartes and Gassendi, who left behind them a great number of eminent diſciples; in *Denmark* Tycho Brahe; in *England* Boyle and Newton; in *Germany* Kepler, Hevelius, and Leibnitz; and in *Switzerland* the two Bernoulli. Theſe philoſophers of the firſt magnitude, if I may uſe that expreſſion, excited ſuch a ſpirit of emulation in *Europe*, and were followed by ſuch a multitude of admirers and rivals, that, if we except thoſe countries that had not yet emerged from a ſtate of ignorance and barbariſm, there was ſcarcely any nation that could not boaſt of poſſeſſing a profound mathematician, a famous aſtronomer, or an eminent philoſopher. Nor were the dukes of *Tuſcany*, however diſtinguiſhed by their hereditary zeal for the ſciences, and their liberality to the learned, the only patrons of philoſophy at this time; ſince it is well known that the monarchs of *Great Britain* and *France*, Charles II., and Lewis XIV., honoured the ſciences, and thoſe that cultivated them, with their protection and encouragement. It is to the munificence of theſe two princes that the *Royal Society of London*, and the *Academy of Sciences* at *Paris*, owe their origin and eſtabliſhment, their privileges, honours, and endowments; and that we, of conſequence, are indebted for the intereſting diſcoveries that have been made by theſe two learned bodies, the end of whoſe inſtitution is the ſtudy and inveſtigation of nature, and the culture of all thoſe arts and ſciences that lead to truth, and are uſeful to mankind [b]. Theſe eſtabliſhments, and the enquiries they were ſo naturally adapted to encourage and promote, proved not only beneficial, in the higheſt degree, to the civil intereſts of mankind, but were alſo productive of ineſtimable advantages to the cauſe of the true religion. By theſe enquiries, the empire of ſuperſtition, which is always the bane of genuine piety, and often a ſource of rebellion and calamity in ſovereign ſtates, was greatly ſhaken; by them the fictitious prodigies, that had ſo long held miſerable mortals in a painful ſtate of ſervitude and terror, were deprived of their influence; by them natural religion was built upon ſolid foundations, and illuſtrated with admirable perſpicuity and evidence; as by them the infinite perfections of the Supreme Being were demonſtrated with the utmoſt clearneſs and force from the frame of the univerſe in general, and alſo from the ſtructure of its various parts.

---

[a] See HEUMAN's *Acta Philoſoph.* part XIV. p. 261. part XV. p. 467. part XVII. p. 803.

---

[b] The Hiſtory of the *Royal Society of London* was publiſhed by Dr. Sprat in 4to, in the year 1722 *. See the *Biblioth. Angloiſe*, tom. xi. p. 1. The Hiſtory of the *Academy of Pillars* has been compoſed by Fontenelle. The reader will find a compariſon between theſe two learned bodies in the fourth volume of the Works of Voltaire, entitled, *Melanges de Litterature et de Philoſophie*, cap. xxvi. p. 317.

☞ * A much more intereſting and ample hiſtory of this reſpectable ſociety has lately been compoſed and publiſhed by Dr. Birch, its learned ſecretary.

History.

XXVII. The improvements made in Hiſtory, and more eſpecially the new degrees of light that were thrown upon the ancient Hiſtory of the church, were of eminent ſervice to the cauſe of genuine Chriſtianity. For thus the original ſources and reaſons of many abſurd opinions and inſtitutions, which antiquity and cuſtom had rendered ſacred, were diſcovered and expoſed in their proper colours; and innumerable errors that had poſſeſſed and perplexed the anxious ſpirits of the credulous and ſuperſtitious multitude, were happily deprived of their authority and influence. Thus, of conſequence, the cheerful light of Truth, and the calm repoſe and tranquillity that attend it, aroſe upon the minds of many, and human life was delivered from the crimes that have been ſanctified by ſuperſtition, and from the tumults and agitations in which it has ſo often involved unhappy mortals. The advantages that flowed from the improvement of hiſtorical knowledge are both

CENT. XVII. SECT. I.

both innumerable and ineſtimable. By this many pious and excellent perſons, whom ignorance or malice had branded with the ignominious title of *Heretics*, were delivered from reproach, recovered their good fame, and thus were ſecured againſt the malignity of ſuperſtition. By this it appeared, that many of thoſe religious controverſies, which had divided nations, friends, and families, and involved ſo often ſovereign ſtates in bloodſhed, rebellion, and crimes of the moſt horrid kind, were owing to the moſt trifling and contemptible cauſes, to the ambiguity and obſcurity of certain theological phraſes and terms, to ſuperſtition, ignorance, and envy, to ghoſtly pride and ambition. By this it was demonſtrated, with the fulleſt evidence, that many of thoſe religious rites and ceremonies, which had been long conſidered as of divine inſtitution, were derived from the moſt inglorious ſources, being either borrowed from the manners and cuſtoms of barbarous nations, or invented with a deſign to deceive the ignorant and credulous, or dictated by the idle viſions of ſenſeleſs enthuſiaſm. By this the ambitious intrigues of the biſhops and other miniſters of religion, who, by perfidious arts, had encroached upon the prerogatives of the throne, uſurped a conſiderable part of its authority and revenues, and held princes in ſubjection to their yoke by terrors of the church, were brought to light. And, to mention no more inſtances, it was by the lamp of Hiſtory that thoſe councils, whoſe decrees had ſo long been regarded as infallible and ſacred, and revered as the dictates of celeſtial wiſdom, were exhibited to the attentive obſerver as aſſemblies, where an odious mixture of ignorance and knavery very frequently preſided. Our happy experience, in theſe latter times, furniſhes daily inſtances of the ſalutary effects of theſe important diſcoveries on the ſtate of the

Chriſtian church, and on the condition of all its members. Hence flow that lenity and moderation that are mutually exerciſed by thoſe who differ from one another in their religious ſentiments; that prudence and caution that are uſed in eſtimating opinions and deciding controverſies; that protection and ſupport that are granted to men of worth, when attacked by the malice of bigotry; and that viſible diminution of the errors, frauds, crimes, and cruelties, with which ſuperſtition formerly embittered the pleaſures of human life, and the enjoyments of ſocial intercourſe.

The ſtudy of eloquence and the languages.

XXVIII. Many of the doctors of this century applied themſelves, with eminent ſucceſs, to the ſtudy of Hebrew and Greek literature, and of the Oriental languages and antiquities. And, as their progreſs in theſe kinds of erudition was rapid, ſo, in many inſtances, was the uſe they made of them truly excellent and laudable. For, by theſe ſuccours, they were enabled to throw light on many difficult paſſages of the ſacred writings that had been ill underſtood and injudiciouſly applied, and which ſome had even employed in ſupporting erroneous opinions, and giving a plauſible colour to pernicious doctrines. Hence it happened, that many patrons and promoters of popular notions, and viſionary and groundleſs fancies, were deprived of the fallacious arguments by which they maintained their errors. It cannot alſo be denied, that the cauſe of religion received conſiderable benefit from the labours of thoſe, who either endeavoured to preſerve the purity and elegance of the Latin language, or who, beholding with emulation the example of the French, employed their induſtry in improving and poliſhing the languages of their reſpective countries. For it muſt be evidently both honourable and advantageous to the Chriſtian church to have always in its boſom men of learning, qualified to write and diſcourſe upon theological ſubjects with preciſion, elegance, eaſe, and perſpicuity, that ſo the ignorant and perverſe may be allured to receive inſtruction, and alſo be able to comprehend with facility the inſtructions they receive.

The law of nature is ſtudied with attention.

XXIX. The rules of morality and practice, which were laid down in the ſacred writings by CHRIST and his apoſtles, aſſumed an advantageous form, received new illuſtrations, and were ſupported upon new and ſolid principles, when that great ſyſtem of law, that reſults from the conſtitution of nature, and the dictates of right reaſon, began to be ſtudied with more diligence, and inveſtigated with more accuracy and perſpicuity than had been the caſe in preceding ages. In this ſublime ſtudy of the *law of nature*, the immortal GROTIUS led the way in his excellent book *Concerning the Rights of War and Peace;* and ſuch was the dignity and importance of the ſubject, that his labours excited the zeal and emulation of men of the moſt eminent genius and abilities [c], who turned their principal attention to this noble ſcience. How much the labours of theſe great men contributed to aſſiſt the miniſters of the Goſpel, both in their diſcourſes and writings concerning the duties and obligations of Chriſtians, may be eaſily ſeen by comparing the books of a practical kind that have been publiſhed ſince the period now under conſideration, with thoſe that were in vogue before that time. [☞ There is ſcarcely a diſcourſe upon any ſubject of Chriſtian morality, how inconſiderable ſoever it may be, that does not bear ſome marks of the improvement which was introduced into the ſcience of morals by thoſe great men, who ſtudied that ſcience in the paths of nature, in the frame and conſtitution of rational and moral beings, and in the relations by which they are rendered members of one great family, under the inſpection and government of one common and univerſal [d] Parent.] It is unqueſtionably certain, that ſince this period the dictates of natural law, and the duties of Chriſtian morality, have been more accurately defined; certain evangelical precepts, whoſe nature and foundations were but imperfectly comprehended in the times of old, more clearly illuſtrated; the ſuperiority which diſtinguiſhes the morality of the Goſpel from that courſe of duty that is deducible from the mere light of nature, more fully demonſtrated; and thoſe common notions and general principles, which are the foundations of moral obligation, and are every way adapted to diſpel all doubts that may ariſe, and all controverſies that may be ſtarted, concerning the nature of evangelical righteouſneſs and virtue, eſtabliſhed with greater evidence and certainty. It may alſo be added, that the impiety of thoſe infidels who have had the effrontery to maintain, that the precepts of the Goſpel are contrary to the dictates of ſound reaſon, repugnant to the conſtitution of our nature, inconſiſtent with the intereſts of civil ſociety, adapted to enervate the mind, and to draw men off from the buſineſs, the duties, and enjoyments of life [e], has been much more triumphantly refuted in the ſeventeenth and eighteenth centuries, than in any other period of the Chriſtian church.

---

[c] See ADAM. FRID. GLAFEY, *Hiſtoria Juris Naturæ;* to which is ſubjoined his *Bibliotheca Juris Naturæ et Gentium.*

---

[d] This ſentence, beginning with *There is ſcarcely a diſcourſe*, and ending with *Univerſal Parent*, is added by the tranſlator.

[e] ROUSS. *Contr. Soc.*

The ſtate of the Ariſtotelian and Paracelſiſtic philoſophy.

XXX. To theſe reflections upon the ſtate of learning and ſcience in general, it may not be improper to add a particular and ſeparate account of the progreſs and revolutions of philoſophy in the Chriſtian ſchools. At the beginning of this century almoſt all the European philoſophers were divided into two claſſes, one of which comprehended the *Peripatetics*, and the other the *Chemiſts*, or *Fire-philoſophers*, as they were often ſtiled. Theſe two claſſes contended warmly for many years which ſhould have the pre-eminence; and a great number of laboured and ſubtile productions were publiſhed during the courſe of this philoſophical conteſt. The *Peripatetics* were in poſſeſſion of the profeſſorſhips in almoſt all the ſchools of learning, and looked upon all ſuch as preſumed, either to reject, or even amend the doctrines of ARISTOTLE, as objects of indignation, little leſs criminal than traitors and rebels. It is however obſervable, that the greateſt part of theſe ſupercilious and perſecuting doctors, if we except thoſe of the academies of *Tubingen*, *Altorf*, *Juliers*, and *Leipſic*, were leſs attached to ARISTOTLE himſelf than to his modern interpreters and commentators. The *Chemiſts* ſpread themſelves through almoſt all *Europe*, and aſſumed the obſcure and ambiguous title of *Roſecrucian Brethren* [*f*], which drew at firſt ſome degree of reſpect,

---

[*f*] The title of *Roſecrucians* evidently denotes the *chemical* philoſophers, and thoſe who blended the doctrines of religion with the ſecrets of chemiſtry. The denomination itſelf is drawn from the ſcience of chemiſtry; and they only who are acquainted with the peculiar language of the chemiſts can underſtand its true ſignification and energy. It is not compounded, as many imagine, of the two words *roſa* and *crux*, which ſignify *roſe* and *croſs*, but of the latter of theſe words, and the Latin word *ros*, which ſignifies *dew*. Of all natural bodies, *dew* is the moſt powerful diſſolvent of gold. The *croſs*, in the chemical ſtyle, is equivalent to *light*; becauſe the figure of the croſs X exhibits, at the ſame time, the three letters of which the

ſpect, as it ſeemed to be borrowed from the arms of LUTHER, which were a *croſs* placed upon a *roſe*. They inveighed againſt the *Peripatetics* with a ſingular degree of bitterneſs and animoſity, repreſented them as corrupters both of religion and philoſophy, and publiſhed a multitude of treatiſes againſt them, which diſcovered little elſe than their folly and their malice. At the head of theſe fanatics were ROBERT FLUDD [g], a native of *England*, and a man of ſurpriſing genius; JACOB BEHMEN, a ſhoe-maker, who lived at *Gorlitz;* and MICHAEL MAYER [h]. Theſe leaders of

---

the word *lux*, i. e. *light* is compounded. Now *lux* is called by this ſect the *ſeed* or *menſtrum of the red dragon;* or, in other words, that groſs and corporeal light, which, when properly digeſted and modified, produces gold. From all this it follows, that a *Roſecrucian* philoſopher is one who, by the intervention and aſſiſtance of the dew, ſeeks for light, or, in other words, the ſubſtance called the *Philoſopher's ſtone*. All other explications of this term are falſe and chimerical. The interpretations that are given of it by the chemiſts, who love, on all occaſions, to involve themſelves in intricacy and darkneſs, are invented merely to deceive thoſe who are ſtrangers to their myſteries. The true energy and meaning of this denomination of *Roſecrucians* did not eſcape the penetration and ſagacity of GASSENDI, as appears by his *Examen Philoſophiæ Fluddanæ*, § xv. tom. iii. opp. p. 261. It was, however, ſtill more fully explained by RENAUDOT, a famous French phyſician, in his *Conferences Publiques*, tom. 4. p. 87. There is a great number of materials and anecdotes relating to the fraternity, rules, obſervances, and writings of the *Roſecrucians* (who made ſuch a noiſe in this century), to be found in ARNOLDI's *Kirchen-und Ketzer Hiſtorie*, part II. p. 1114.

[g] See for an account of this ſingular man, from whoſe writings JACOB BEHMEN derived all his myſtical and rapturous doctrine, WOOD's *Athenæ Oxonienſes*, vol. i. p. 610, and *Hiſtor. et Antiqq. Academiæ Oxonienſis*, lib. ii. p. 308.—For an account of HELMONT, father and ſon, ſee HEN. WITTE, *Memor. Philoſoph.*— JOACH. FRID. FELLER, in *Miſcellan. Leibnitian.*—Several writers beſides ARNOLDI have given an account of JACOB BEHMEN.*.

[h] See MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. i. p. 376.

* See for a further account of JACOB BEHMEN SECT. II. PART II. CHAP. I. § XL. of this Hiſtory.

CENT. XVII. SECT. I.

the ſect were followed by JOHN BAPTIST HELMONT, and his ſon FRANCIS, CHRISTIAN KNORRIUS DE ROSENROTH, KUHLMAN, NOLLIUS, SPERBER, and many others of various fame. An uniformity of opinion, and a ſpirit of concord, ſeem ſcarcely poſſible in ſuch a ſociety as this. For as a great part of its doctrine is derived from certain internal feelings, and certain flights of imagination, which can neither be comprehended nor defined, and is ſupported by certain teſtimonies of the external ſenſes, whoſe reports are equally illuſory and changeable; ſo it is remarkable, that, among the more eminent writers of this ſect, there are ſcarcely any two who adopt the ſame tenets and ſentiments. There are, nevertheleſs, ſome common principles that are generally embraced, and that ſerve as a centre of union to the ſociety. They all maintain, that the diſſolution of bodies, by the power of fire, is the only way through which men can arrive at true wiſdom, and come to diſcern the firſt principles of things. They all acknowledge a certain analogy and harmony between the powers of nature and the doctrines of religion, and believe that the Deity governs *the kingdom of grace* by the ſame laws with which he rules the *kingdom of nature*; and hence it is that they employ chemical denominations to expreſs the truths of religion. They all hold, that there is a ſort of *divine energy* or *ſoul* diffuſed through the frame of the univerſe, which ſome call *Archæus*, others the *Univerſal Spirit*, and which others mention under different appellations. They all talk in the moſt obſcure and ſuperſtitious manner of what they call the *ſignatures of things*, of the power of the ſtars over all corporeal beings, and their particular influence upon the human race, of the efficacy of magic, and the various ranks and orders of demons. In fine, they all agree in throwing out the moſt crude, incomprehenſible notions and ideas, in the moſt obſcure, quaint, and unuſual expreſſions.

The philoſophy of Gaſſendi.

XXXI. This controverſy between the *Chemiſts* and *Peripatetics* was buried in ſilence and oblivion as ſoon as a new and more ſeemly form of philoſophy was preſented to the world by two great men, who reflected a luſtre upon the French nation, GASSENDI and DES CARTES. The former, whoſe profound knowledge of mathematics and aſtronomy was accompanied with the moſt engaging eloquence, and an acquaintance with all the various branches of ſolid erudition and polite literature, was canon of *Digne*, and profeſſor of mathematics at *Paris*. The latter, who was a man of quality and bred a ſoldier, ſurpaſſed the greateſt part of his cotemporaries in acuteneſs, ſubtilty, and extent of genius, though he was much inferior to GASSENDI in point of learning. In the year 1624, GASSENDI attacked ARISTOTLE, and the whole ſect of his commentators and followers, with great reſolution and ingenuity [*i*]; but the reſentment and indignation which he drew upon himſelf from all quarters by this bold attempt, and the ſweetneſs of his natural temper, which made him an enemy to diſſention and conteſt, engaged him to deſiſt, and to ſuſpend an enterpriſe that, by oppoſing the prejudices, was ſo adapted to inflame the paſſions of the learned. Hence no more than two books of the work he had compoſed againſt the Ariſtotelians were made public; the other five were ſuppreſſed [*j*]. He alſo wrote againſt FLUDD; and, by refuting him,

---

☞ [*i*] The title of his book againſt the Ariſtotelians is as follows: *Exercitationum paradoxicarum adverſus Ariſtoteleos Libri* VII. *in quibus præcipua totius Peripateticæ Doctrinæ fundamenta excutiuntur; opiniones vero, aut ex vetuſtioribus obſoletæ, ſtabiliuntur.*

[*j*] See BOUGERELL, *Vie de* GASSENDI, p. 17. & 23.

refuted at the ſame time the *Roſecrucian Brethren*; and here the Ariſtotelians ſeemed to behold his labours with a favourable eye. After having overturned ſeveral falſe and viſionary ſyſtems of philoſophy, he began to think of ſubſtituting ſomething more ſolid and ſatisfactory in their place; and in purſuance of this deſign he proceeded with the utmoſt circumſpection and caution. He recommended to others, and followed himſelf, that wiſe method of philoſophical inveſtigation, which, with a ſlow and timorous pace, riſes from the objects of ſenſe to the diſcuſſions of reaſon, and arrives at truth by aſſiduity, experiment, and an attentive obſervation of the laws of nature; or, to expreſs the ſame thing in other words, GASSENDI ſtruck out that judicious method, which, by an attention to facts, to the changes and motions of the natural world, leads by degrees to general principles, and lays a ſolid foundation for rational enquiry. In the application of this method, he had recourſe chiefly to mathematical ſuccours, from a perſuaſion that demonſtration and certainty were the peculiar fruits of that accurate and luminous ſcience. He drew no aſſiſtance from the ſcience of metaphyſics, which he overlooked from an opinion that the greateſt part of its rules and deciſions were too precarious to ſatisfy a ſincere inquirer, animated with the love of truth [*k*].

The Carteſian philoſophy.

XXXII. DES CARTES followed a very different method in his philoſophical reſearches. He abandoned the mathematics, which he had at firſt looked upon as the tree of knowledge, and employed the ſcience of abſtract ideas, or metaphyſics, in the inveſtigation of truth. Having accordingly laid down a few plain general principles, which ſeemed to be deduced immediately from the nature of man, his firſt buſineſs was to form *diſtinct notions* of Deity, matter, ſoul, body, ſpace, the univerſe, and the various parts of which it is compoſed. From theſe notions, examined with attention, compared and combined together according to their mutual relations, connections, and reſemblances, and reduced into a kind of ſyſtem, he proceeded ſtill further, and made admirable uſe of them in reforming the other branches of philoſophy, and giving them a new degree of ſtability and conſiſtence. This he effected by connecting all his branches of philoſophical reaſonings in ſuch a manner, that *principles* and *conſequences* followed each other in the moſt accurate order, and that the latter ſeemed to flow from the former in the moſt natural manner. This method of purſuing truth could not fail to attract the admiration of many: and ſo indeed it happened; for no ſooner had DES CARTES publiſhed his diſcoveries in philoſophy, than a conſiderable number of eminent men, in different parts of *Europe*, who had long entertained a high diſguſt againſt the inelegant and ambiguous jargon of the ſchools, adopted theſe diſcoveries with zeal, declared their approbation of the new ſyſtem, and expreſſed their deſire that its author ſhould be ſubſtituted in the place of the Peripatetics, as a philoſophical guide to the youth in the public ſeminaries of learning. On the other hand, the Peripatetics, or Ariſtotelians, ſeconded by the influence of the clergy, who apprehended that the cauſe of religion was aimed at and endangered by theſe philoſophical innovations, made a prodigious noiſe, and left no means unemployed to prevent the downfal of their old ſyſtem, and to diminiſh the growing re-

---

[*k*] See GASSENDI's *Inſtitutiones Philoſophiæ*; a diffuſe production, which takes up the two firſt volumes of his works, and in which his principal deſign is to ſhew, that thoſe opinions, of both the ancient and modern philoſophers, which are deduced from metaphyſical principles, have little ſolidity, and are generally defective in point of evidence and perſpicuity.

putation

putation of the new philoſophy. To execute this invidious purpoſe with the more facility, they not only accuſed DES CARTES of the moſt dangerous and pernicious errors, but went ſo far, in the extravagance of their malignity, as to bring a charge of Atheiſm againſt him. This furious zeal of the Ariſtotelians will not appear ſo extraordinary, when it is conſidered, that they contended not ſo much for their philoſophical ſyſtem as for the honours, advantages, and profits they derived from it. The *Theoſophiſts*, *Roſecrucians*, and *Chemiſts*, entered into this conteſt againſt DES CARTES, but conducted themſelves with more moderation than the Ariſtotelians, notwithſtanding their perſuaſion that the Peripatetic philoſophy, though chimerical and impious, was much leſs intolerable than the Carteſian ſyſtem [*l*]. The conſequences of this diſpute were favourable to the progreſs of ſcience; for the wiſer part of the European philoſophers, although they did not at all adopt the ſentiments of DES CARTES, were nevertheleſs encouraged and animated by his example to carry on their enquiries with more freedom from the reſtraints of tradition and perſonal authority, than they had formerly done, and to throw reſolutely from their necks that yoke of ſervitude, under which ARISTOTLE and his followers had ſo long kept them in ſubjection.

Gaſſendi the chief adverſary of Des Cartes.

XXXIII. The moſt eminent contemporaries of DES CARTES applauded, in general, the efforts he made towards the reformation of philoſophy, and that noble reſolution with which he broke the ſhackles of magiſterial authority, and ſtruck out new paths, in which he proceeded without a guide, in the ſearch after truth. They alſo approved of his method of ariſing, with caution and accuracy, from the moſt ſimple, and, as it were, the primary dictates of reaſon and nature, to truths and propoſitions of a more complex and intricate kind, and of admitting nothing as truth, that was not *clearly* and *diſtinctly* apprehended as ſuch. They went ſtill further, and unanimouſly acknowledged, that he had made moſt valuable and important diſcoveries in philoſophy, and had demonſtrated ſeveral truths which, before his time, were received upon no other evidence than that of tradition and conjecture. But theſe acknowledgments did not hinder ſome of thoſe who made them with the greateſt ſincerity, from finding ſeveral eſſential defects in the philoſophy of this great man. They looked upon his account of the cauſes and principles of natural things to be for the moſt part hypothetical, founded on fancy rather than experience. Nay, they attacked the fundamental principles upon which the whole ſyſtem of his philoſophy was built, ſuch as his ideas of the Deity, of the univerſe, of matter and ſpirit, of the laws of motion, and other points that were connected with theſe. Some of theſe principles they pronounced uncertain; others of a pernicious tendency, and adapted to engender the moſt dangerous errors; others again they conſidered as directly contrary to the language of experience. At the head of theſe objectors was his own fellow-citizen GASSENDI, who had made war before him upon the Ariſtotelians and Chemiſts; who, in genius, was his equal; in learning, by much his ſuperior; and whoſe mathematical knowledge was moſt uncommon and extenſive. This formidable adverſary directed his firſt attacks againſt the metaphyſical principles, which ſupported the whole ſtructure of the Carteſian philoſophy. He then proceeded ſtill further; and, in the place of the phyſical ſyſtem of DES CARTES, ſubſtituted one that reſembled not a little the natural philoſophy of EPICURUS, though far ſuperior to it in ſolidity, much more rational, conſiſtent, and perfect, being founded not on the illuſory viſions of fancy, but on the teſtimony of ſenſe and the dictates of experience [m]. This new and ſagacious obſerver of nature had not many followers, and his diſciples were much leſs numerous than thoſe of DES CARTES. But what he wanted in number, was ſufficiently compenſated by the merit and reputation of thoſe who adopted his philoſophical ſyſtem; for he was followed by ſome of the moſt eminent men in *Europe*, by perſons diſtinguiſhed in the higheſt degree, by their indefatigable application and their extenſive knowledge both of natural philoſophy and mathematics. It is alſo obſervable that he had but few diſciples in his own country; but among the *Engliſh*, who in his time were remarkable for their application to ſtudies of a phyſical and mathematical kind, a conſiderable number adopted his philoſophical ſyſtem. Nay, it is remarkable, that even thoſe eminent philoſophers and divines, ſuch as WHICHCOT, GALE, CUDWORTH, and MORE, who entered the liſts with HOBBES (whoſe doctrine came nearer to the principles of GASSENDI than to the ſyſtem of DES CARTES), and revived ancient Platoniſm in order to cruſh under its weight the philoſopher of *Malmeſbury*, placed GASSENDI and PLATO in the ſame claſs, and explained the ſentiments of the latter in ſuch a manner as to make them appear quite agreeable to the principles of the former [n].

[*l*] See BAILLET, *Vie de* DES CARTES.—As alſo the *General Dictionary*, at the article DES CARTES.

---

[m] See his *Diſquiſitio Metaphyſica, ſeu Dubitationes et Inſtantiæ adverſus Carteſii Metaphyſicam, et Reſponſa*, which are publiſhed in the third volume of his works, p. 283.—BERNIER, a celebrated French phyſician, has given an accurate view of the philoſophy of GASSENDI in his abridgment of it, publiſhed in French at *Lyons*, in the year 1684, in eight volumes in 12mo. This abridgment will give the reader a clearer account of this philoſophy than even the works of GASSENDI himſelf, in which his meaning is often expreſſed in an ambiguous manner, and which are, beſides, loaded with ſuperfluous erudition. The Life of GASSENDI, accurately written by BOUGERELLE, a prieſt of the oratory, was publiſhed at *Paris* in 1737.—See *Biblioth. Françoiſe*, tom. xxvii. p. 353.

Two leading philoſophical ſects, *viz.* The Mathematical and Metaphyſical.

XXXIV. From this period muſt be dated that famous ſchiſm that divided the philoſophical world into two great ſects, which, though almoſt agreed concerning thoſe points that are of the greateſt utility and importance in human life, differ widely about the principles of human knowledge, and the fundamental points from whence the philoſopher muſt proceed in his ſearch of truth. Of theſe ſects the one may properly be called *Metaphyſical*, and the other *Mathematical*. The *Metaphyſical* ſect follows the ſyſtem of DES CARTES; the *Mathematical* one directs its reſearches by the principles of GASSENDI. The former looks upon truth as attainable by abſtract reaſoning; the latter ſeeks after it by obſervation and experience. The follower of DES CARTES attributes little to the external ſenſes, and much to meditation and diſcuſſion. The diſciple of GASSENDI, on the contrary, places little confidence in metaphyſical diſcuſſion, and has principally recourſe to the reports of ſenſe and the contemplation of nature. The *former*, from a ſmall number of abſtract truths, deduces a long ſeries of propoſitions, in order to arrive at a preciſe and accurate knowledge of God and nature, of body and ſpirit; the *latter* admits theſe metaphyſical truths, but at the ſame time denies the poſſibility of erecting, upon their baſis, a regular and ſolid ſyſtem of philoſophy, without the aid of aſſiduous obſervation and repeated experiments, which are the moſt natural and effectual means of philoſophical progreſs and improvement. The *one*, eagle-like, ſoars, with an intrepid flight, to the firſt fountain of truth, and to the general relations and final cauſes of things; and deſcending from thence explains, by them, the various changes and appearances of nature, the attributes and counſels of the Deity, the moral conſtitution and duties of man, the frame and ſtructure of the univerſe. The *other*, more difficult and cautious, obſerves with attention, and examines with aſſiduity, the objects that are before his eyes; and ariſes gradually from them to the firſt cauſe and the primordial principles of things. The *Carteſians* ſuppoſe, that many things are known by man with the utmoſt certainty; and hence their propenſity to form their opinions and doctrines into a regular ſyſtem. The followers of GASSENDI conſider man as in a ſtate of ignorance with reſpect to an immenſe number of things, and, conſequently, think it incumbent upon them to ſuſpend their judgment in a multitude of caſes, until time and experience diſpel their darkneſs; and hence it is alſo, that they conſider a *ſyſtem* as an attempt of too adventurous a nature, and by no means proportioned to the narrow extent of human knowledge; or, at leaſt, they think, that the buſineſs of *ſyſtem-making* ought to be left to the philoſophers of future times, who, by joining together the obſervations and experience of many ages, ſhall have acquired a more ſatisfactory and accurate knowledge of nature than has been yet attained.

---

[n] See the *Preface* to the Latin tranſlation of CUDWORTH's *Intellectual Syſtem*; as alſo the *Remarks* that are added to that tranſlation. ☞ Dr. MOSHEIM is the author of that *Tranſlation* and of theſe *Remarks*.

Theſe diſſentions and conteſts concerning the firſt principles of human knowledge, produced various debates upon other ſubjects of the utmoſt moment and importance; ſuch as, the *nature of God*, the *eſſence of matter*, the *elements* or conſtituent principles *of bodies*, the *laws of motion*, the *manner* in which the Divine Providence exerts itſelf *in the government of the world*, the *frame and ſtructure* of the univerſe, the *nature*, *union*, and *joint operations* of *ſoul* and *body*. If we conſider attentively the profound and intricate nature of theſe ſubjects, together with the limits, debility, and imperfections of the human underſtanding, we ſhall ſee too much reaſon to fear, that theſe conteſts will laſt as long as the preſent ſtate of man [o]. The wiſe and the good, ſenſible of this, will carry on ſuch debates with a ſpirit of mildneſs and mutual forbearance; and knowing that differences in opinions are inevitable where truth is ſo difficult of acceſs, will guard againſt that temerity with which too many diſputants accuſe their antagoniſts of irreligion and impiety [p].

XXXV. All

---

[o] VOLTAIRE publiſhed, in the year 1740, at *Amſterdam*, a pamphlet, entitled, *La Metaphyſique de Newton, ou Parallèle des Sentimens de Newton et de Leibnitz*, which, though ſuperficial and inaccurate, may, nevertheleſs, be uſeful to thoſe readers who have not application enough to draw from better ſources, and are, nevertheleſs, deſirous to know how much theſe two philoſophical ſects differ in their principles and tenets.

[p] It is abundantly known, that DES CARTES and his metaphyſical followers were accuſed by many of ſtriking at the foundations of all religion; nor is this accuſation entirely withdrawn even in our times. See in the miſcellaneous works of Father HARDOUIN his *Atheiſts unmaſked*. Among theſe pretended Atheiſts, DES CARTES, with his two famous diſciples ANTHONY LE GRAND and SILVAN REGIS hold the firſt rank; nor is Father MALEBRANCHE, though he ſeems rather chargeable with fanaticiſm than atheiſm, exempted from a place in this odious liſt. It is true HARDOUIN, who gives ſo liberally a place in the atheiſtical claſs to theſe great men, was himſelf a viſionary dreamer, whoſe judgment, in many caſes, is little to be reſpected; but it is alſo true, that, in the work now under conſideration, he does not reaſon from his own whimſical notions, but draws all his arguments from thoſe of the followers of ARISTOTLE and GASSENDI, who have

The Metaphyſical or Carteſian philoſophy improved and propagated with ſucceſs.

XXXV. All thoſe who had either adopted, without exception, the principles of DES CARTES, or who, without going ſo far, had approved of the method and rules laid down by him for the inveſtigation of truth, employed all their zeal and induſtry in correcting, amending, confirming, and illuſtrating, the Metaphyſical ſpecies of philoſophy; and the number of its votaries was prodigious, particularly in *France* and in the *United Provinces*. But among the members of this philoſophical ſect there were ſome who aimed at the deſtruction of all religion, more eſpecially SPINOZA, and others, who, like BALTHASAR BECKER [q], made uſe of the principles of DES CARTES, to overturn ſome doctrines of Chriſtianity, and to pervert others. This circumſtance proved diſadvantageous to the whole ſect, and brought it into diſrepute in many places. The Metaphyſical philoſophy fell, however, afterwards

---

have oppoſed, with the greateſt ſucceſs and acuteneſs, the Carteſian ſyſtem. Even VOLTAIRE, notwithſtanding the moderation with which he expreſſes himſelf, ſeems plainly enough to give his aſſent to the accuſers of DES CARTES. On the other hand, it muſt be obſerved, that theſe accuſers are cenſured in their turn by ſeveral modern metaphyſicians. GASSENDI, for example, is charged by ARNAULD with overturning the doctrine of the ſoul's immortality in his controverſy with DES CARTES, and by LEIBNITZ with corrupting and deſtroying the whole ſyſtem of natural religion. See DES MAIZEAUX, *Recueil de diverſes pièces ſur la Philoſophie*, tom. ii. p. 166 *. LEIBNITZ has alſo ventured to affirm, that Sir ISAAC NEWTON and his followers rob the Deity of ſome of his moſt excellent attributes, and ſap the foundations of natural religion. In ſhort, the controverſial writings on both ſides are filled with raſh and indecent reproaches of this kind.

☞ [q] See for a further account of the particular tenets and opinions of BECKER, Sect. II. Part II. Chap. II. § XXXV. of this century.

☞ * If Dr. MOSHEIM refers to the ſecond edition of DES MAIZEAUX *Recueil*, the page is inaccurately quoted; for it is at page 155 of the volume above mentioned, that GASSENDI is cenſured by LEIBNITZ. It may be further obſerved, that the cenſure is not conveyed in ſuch ſtrong terms as thoſe employed by our hiſtorian. LEIBNITZ ſays, that GASSENDI appeared to heſitate and waver too much concerning the nature of the ſoul, and the principles of natural religion.

into better hands, and was treated with great wiſdom and acuteneſs by MALEBRANCHE, a man of uncommon eloquence and ſubtilty; and by LEIBNITZ, whoſe name is conſigned to immortality as one of the greateſt geniuſes that have appeared in the world [r]. Neither of theſe great men, indeed, adopted all the principles and doctrines of DES CARTES; but they both approved, upon the whole, of his philoſophical method, which they enlarged, amended, and improved, by ſeveral additions and corrections, that rendered its procedure more luminous and ſure. This is more eſpecially true of LEIBNITZ, who, rejecting the ſuggeſtions of fancy, ſeemed to follow no other guides than reaſon and judgment; for MALEBRANCHE having received from nature a warm and exuberant imagination, was too much ruled by its dictates, and was thus often imperceptibly led into the viſionary regions of enthuſiaſm.

The progreſs of the Mathematical ſect.

XXXVI. The Mathematical philoſophy, already mentioned, was much leſs ſtudied and adopted than the Metaphyſical ſyſtem, and its followers in *France* were very few in number. But it met with a favourable reception in *Britain*, whoſe philoſophers perceiving, in its infant and unfiniſhed features, the immortal lines of VERULAM's wiſdom, ſnatched it from its cradle, in a ſoil where it was ready to periſh, cheriſhed it with parental tenderneſs, and have ſtill continued their zealous efforts to bring it to maturity and perfection. The Royal Society of *London*, which may be conſidered as the philoſophical ſeminary of the nation, took it under their protection, and have neither ſpared expence nor pains to cultivate and improve it, and to render it ſubſervient to the purpoſes of life. It owed, more eſpecially, a great part of its progreſs and improvement to the countenance, induſtry, and genius of that immortal protector of ſcience, the pious and venerable Mr. BOYLE, whoſe memory will be ever precious to the worthy and the wiſe, the friends of religion, learning, and mankind. The illuſtrious names of BARROW, WALLIS, and LOCKE, may alſo be added to the liſt of thoſe who contributed to the progreſs of natural knowledge. Nor were the learned divines of the *Engliſh* nation (tho' that Order has often excited the complaints of philoſophers, and been ſuppoſed to behold, with a jealous and ſuſpicious eye, the efforts of philoſophy as dangerous to the cauſe of religion) leſs zealous than the other patrons of ſcience in this noble cauſe. On the contrary, they looked upon the improvement of natural knowledge not only as innocent, but as of the higheſt utility and importance; as admirably adapted to excite and maintain in the minds of men a profound veneration for the Supreme Creator and Governor of the world, and to furniſh new ſupports to the cauſe of religion; and alſo as agreeable both to the laws and ſpirit of the Goſpel, and to the ſentiments of the primitive church. And hence it was, that thoſe doctors, who, in the lectures founded by Mr. BOYLE, attacked the enemies of religion, employed in this noble and pious attempt the ſuccours of philoſophy with the moſt happy and triumphant ſucceſs. But the immortal man, to whoſe immenſe genius and indefatigable induſtry philoſophy owed its greateſt improvements, and who carried the lamp of knowledge into paths of nature that had been unexplored before his time, was Sir ISAAC NEWTON [s], whoſe name was revered, and his genius admired, even by his warmeſt adverſaries. This great man ſpent, with uninterrupted aſſiduity, the whole of a long life in correcting, digeſting, and enlarging, the new philoſophy, and in throwing upon it the light of demonſtration and evidence, both by obſerving the laws of nature, and by ſubjecting them to the rules of calculation; and thus he introduced a great change into natural ſcience, and brought it to a very high degree of perfection [t].

---

[r] For an ample and intereſting account of MALEBRANCHE and his philoſophy, ſee FONTENELLE's *Eloge des Académiciens de l'Académie Royale des Sciences*, tom. i. p. 317. and for a view of the errors and defects of his metaphyſical ſyſtem, ſee HARDOUIN's *Atheiſts unmaſked*, in his *Oeuvres Melées*, p. 43.—FONTENELLE has alſo given an account of the life and philoſophical ſentiments of LEIBNITZ in the work already quoted, vol. ii. p. 9.; but a much more ample one has been publiſhed in German by CHARLES GUNTHER LEWIS, in his hiſtory of the *Leibnitian Philoſophy*. However, the genius and philoſophy of this great man are beſt to be learned from his letters to KORTHOLT, publiſhed at *Leipſic* in three volumes.

☞ [s] Mr. HUME's account of this great man is extremely juſt, and contains ſome peculiar ſtrokes that do honour to this elegant painter of minds. "In NEWTON, *ſays he*, this iſland may boaſt of having produced the greateſt and rareſt genius that ever aroſe for the ornament and inſtruction of the ſpecies. Cautious in admitting no principles, but ſuch as were founded in experiment; but reſolute to adopt every ſuch principle, however new and unuſual: From modeſty ignorant of his ſuperiority above the reſt of mankind, and thence leſs careful to accommodate his reaſonings to common apprehenſions: More anxious to merit than acquire fame: He was, from theſe cauſes, long unknown to the world; but his reputation, at laſt, broke out with a luſtre, which ſcarce any writer, during his own lifetime, had ever before attained. While NEWTON ſeemed to draw off the veil from ſome of the myſteries of nature, he ſhewed, at the ſame time, the imperfections of the mechanical philoſophy; and thereby reſtored her ultimate ſecrets to that obſcurity, in which they ever did and ever will remain."

[t] The *Mathematical Principles of Natural Philoſophy*, as alſo the other writings, whether philoſophical, mathematical, or theological, of this great man, are abundantly known. There is an elegant account of his life and literary and philoſophical merit given by FONTENELLE, in his *Eloge des Académiciens de l'Académie Royale des Sciences*, tom. ii. p. 293—323.—See alſo the *Biblioth. Angloiſe*, tom. xv. par. II. p. 545. and *Biblioth. Raiſonnée*, tom. vi. par. II. p. 478. ☞ See more eſpecially the late learned and ingenious Mr. MACLAURIN's *Account of Sir Iſaac Newton's Diſcoveries*, &c.

The *Engliſh* look upon it as an unqueſtionable proof of the ſolidity and excellence of the Newtonian philoſophy, that its moſt eminent votaries were friends to religion, and have tranſmitted to poſterity ſhining examples of piety and virtue; while, on the contrary, the Carteſian or Metaphyſical ſyſtem has exhibited, in its followers, many flagrant inſtances of irreligion, and ſome of the moſt horrid impiety.

Of the philoſophers who adopt neither of theſe ſyſtems.

XXXVII. The two famous philoſophical ſects now mentioned, deprived, indeed, all the ancient ſyſtems of natural ſcience both of their credit and their diſciples; and hence it might have been expected that they would have totally engroſſed and divided between them the ſuffrages of the learned. But this was not the caſe; the liberty of thinking being reſtored by DES CARTES and NEWTON, who broke the fetters of prejudice, in which philoſophical ſuperſtition had confined, in former times, the human underſtanding, a variety of ſects ſprung up. Some truſting in their ſuperior genius and ſagacity, and others, more remarkable for the exuberance of their fancy than for the ſolidity of their judgment, pretended to ſtrike out new paths in the unknown regions of nature, and new methods of inveſtigating truth; but the number of their diſciples was ſmall, and the duration of their inventions tranſitory, and therefore it is ſufficient to have barely mentioned them. There was another ſort of men, whom mediocrity of genius, or an indolent turn of mind, indiſpoſed for inveſtigating truth by the exertion of their own talents and powers, and who, terrified at the view of ſuch an arduous taſk, contented themſelves with borrowing from the different ſects ſuch of their reſpective tenets as appeared moſt remarkable for their perſpicuity and ſolidity, more eſpecially thoſe concerning which all the different ſects were agreed. Theſe they compiled and digeſted into a ſyſtem, and puſhed their inquiries no further. The philoſophers of this claſs are generally termed *Eclectics*. From theſe remarkable differences of ſentiment and ſyſtem that reigned among the jarring ſects, ſome perſons, otherwiſe diſtinguiſhed by their acuteneſs and ſagacity, took occaſion to repreſent truth as unattainable by ſuch a ſhort-ſighted being as man, and to revive the deſperate and uncomfortable doctrine (ſhall I call it, or jargon) of the Sceptics, that had long been buried in that ſilence and oblivion it ſo juſtly deſerved. The moſt eminent of theſe cloudy philoſophers were SANCHES, a phyſician of *Toulouſe* [u], DE LA MOTHE LE VAYER [w], HUET, biſhop of *Avranches* [x], to whom we may add, without temerity, the famous

---

[u] There is ſtill extant a famous book of this writer, entitled, *De eo quod nihil ſcitur*, which, with the reſt of his works and an account of his life, was publiſhed in 4to at *Toulouſe*, in the year 1636.—See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article SANCHEZ; as alſo VILLEMANDI *Scepticiſmus debellatus*, cap. iv. p. 32.

[w] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article VAYER.

[x] HUET's book *Concerning the Weakneſs of Human Reaſon* was publiſhed after his death, in French, at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1723, and lately in Latin. It appears, however, that this eminent writer had, long before the compoſition of this book, recommended the ſceptical method of conducting philoſophical reſearches, and looked upon this method as the beſt adapted to eſtabliſh the truth of Chriſtianity upon ſolid foundations. See the *Commentarius de Rebus ad eum pertinentibus*, lib. iv. p. 230. and *Demonſtrat. Evangelicæ Præfat.* § iv. p. 9. where he commends *their* manner of proceeding, *who*, by ſceptical arguments, invalidate all philoſophical principles, before they begin to prove the truth of Chriſtianity to thoſe who doubt of its evidence. It is well known that the Jeſuits, who were particularly favoured by HUET, have, on many occaſions, employed this method to throw duſt into the eyes of the Proteſtants, and thus lead them blindfold into the Romiſh communion; and that they ſtill continue to practiſe the ſame inſidious inſtrument of ſeduction.

CENT. XVII. SECT. I.

BAYLE [y], who, by the erudition and wit that abound in his voluminous works, has acquired ſuch a diſtinguiſhed reputation in the Republic of Letters.

---

[y] Every thing relating to the life and ſentiments of BAYLE is abundantly and univerſally known. His life, compoſed by DES MAIZEAUX, was publiſhed in the year 1732, at the *Hague*, in two volumes 8vo.—The ſcepticiſm of this inſidious and ſeducing writer was unmaſked and refuted, with great learning and force of argument, by the late Mr. CROUSAZ, in a voluminous French work, entitled, *Traité du Pyrrhoniſme*, of which Mr. FORMEY has given an elegant and judicious abridgment, under the title of *Triomphe de l'Evidence.*

SECTION II.

PART I.

The HISTORY *of the more* ANCIENT CHURCHES.

CHAP. I.

Containing the HISTORY *of the* ROMISH CHURCH.

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I.

The popes of this century.

I. HIPPOLITO ALDOBRANDINI, under the papal name of CLEMENT VIII., continued to rule the church of *Rome* at the commencement of this century, having been elected to that high dignity towards the concluſion of the preceding one. The eminent abilities and inſidious dexterity of this pontif, as alſo his ardent deſire of extinguiſhing the Proteſtant religion, and extending the limits of the Romiſh church, are univerſally acknowledged; but it is much queſtioned, whether his prudence was equal to the arduous nature of his ſtation as pontif, and the critical circumſtances of an incidental kind that aroſe during his adminiſtration [a]. He was ſucceeded in the year 1605 by LEO XI., of the houſe of MEDICIS, who died a few weeks after his election; and thus left the papal chair open to CAMILLO BORGHESE, who filled it under the denomination of PAUL V. This pontif was of a haughty and violent ſpirit, jealous

---

☞ [a] This pontif had an edition of the *Vulgate* publiſhed, which was very different from that of Pope SIXTUS; and this is one of the many inſtances of the *contrariety* of opinions that has prevailed among the *infallible* heads of the church of Rome.

jealous to exceſs of his authority, and inſatiably furious in the execution of his vengeance upon ſuch as encroached on his pretended prerogative, as appears in a ſtriking manner, by his raſh and unſucceſsful conteſt with the Venetians [b].—Gregory XV. [c], who was raiſed to the pontificate in the year 1621, ſeemed to be of a milder diſpoſition, though he was not leſs defective than his predeceſſor in equity and clemency towards thoſe that had ſeparated themſelves from the church of *Rome*. An unjuſt ſeverity againſt the friends of the Reformation is, indeed, the general and inevitable character of the Roman pontifs; for,

---

☞ [b] This conteſt aroſe partly from two edicts of the Republic of *Venice* for preventing the unneceſſary increaſe of religious buildings, and the augmentation of the enormous wealth of the clergy; and partly from the proſecution of two eccleſiaſtics for capital crimes, who had not been delivered up to the Pope at his requiſition. It is not ſurpriſing that theſe proceedings of the Venetians, however juſt and equitable, ſhould enflame the ambitious fury of a pontif who called himſelf *Vice-God, the Monarch of Chriſtendom*, and *the Supporter of Papal Omnipotence*. Accordingly Paul laid all the dominions of the Republic under an *interdict*; while the Venetians, on the other hand, declared that unjuſt and tyrannical mandate null and void; and baniſhed from their territory the Jeſuits and Capuchins, who had openly diſobeyed the laws of the ſtate. Preparations for war were making on both ſides, when an accommodation, not very honourable to the Pope, was brought about by the mediation of Henry IV. of *France*. This controverſy between the Pope and the Venetians produced ſeveral important pieces, compoſed by Sarpi on the ſide of the Republic, and by Baronius and Bellarmine in behalf of the pontif. The controverſy concerning the nature and limits of the Pope's pretended ſupremacy is judiciouſly ſtated, and the papal pretenſions accurately examined, by Sarpi, in his hiſtory of this tyrannical *interdict*, which, in Italian, occupies the fourth volume of his works, and was tranſlated into Latin by William Bedell, of *Cambridge*.—It was Paul V. that diſhonoured his title of *Holineſs*, and caſt an eternal ſtain upon his *infallibility*, by an expreſs approbation of the doctrine of Suarez, the Jeſuit, in defence of the murder of kings.

☞ [c] His family-name was Alexander Ludivisio.

without this, they would be deſtitute of the predominant and diſtinctive mark of the papacy. A pope, with ſentiments of toleration and charity towards thoſe who refuſe a blind ſubmiſſion to his opinions and deciſions, is a contradiction in terms. URBAN VIII., whoſe family name was MAFFEI BARBERINI, and who, by his intereſt in the conclave, aſcended the papal throne in the year 1623, was a man of letters, an eloquent writer, an elegant poet, and a generous and munificent patron of learning and genius [d]; but nothing can equal the rigour and barbarity with which he treated all that bore the name of Proteſtants. He may be indeed conſidered as a good and equitable ruler of the church, when compared with INNOCENT X., of the family of PAMFILI, who ſucceeded him in the year 1644.— This unworthy pontif, to a profound ignorance of all thoſe things which it was neceſſary for a Chriſtian biſhop to know, joined the moſt ſhameful indolence and the moſt notorious profligacy. For he abandoned his perſon, his dignity, the adminiſtration of his temporal affairs, and the government of the church, to the diſpoſal of Donna OLYMPIA [e], a woman of corrupt morals, inſatiable avarice, and boundleſs ambition [f]. His zealous endeavours to prevent the peace of *Weſtphalia*, however odious they may appear, when conſidered in themſelves, ought not to be reckoned among his perſonal crimes, ſince it is to be ſuppoſed, that any other pontif, in his place, would have made the ſame attempts without heſitation or remorſe. He was ſucceeded in the papal chair, in the year 1655, by FABIO CHIGI, who aſſumed the title of ALEXANDER VII., and who, though leſs odious than his predeceſſor, was nevertheleſs poſſeſſed of all the pernicious qualities that are neceſſary to conſtitute a true pope, and without which the papal juriſdiction and majeſty cannot be maintained. The other parts of his character are drawn, much to his diſadvantage, by ſeveral ingenious and eminent writers of the Romiſh church, who repreſent him as a man of a mean genius, unequal to great or difficult undertakings, full of craft and diſſimulation, and chargeable with the moſt ſhameful levity and the greateſt inconſiſtency of ſentiment and conduct [g].

---

[d] See LEONI ALLATII *Apes Urbanæ*, of which FABRICIUS publiſhed a ſecond edition at *Hamburg*. This little work is a ſort of *Index*, or liſt, of all the learned and eminent men that adorned *Rome* under the pontificate of URBAN VIII., and experienced the munificence and liberality of that pontif; and their number is far from being ſmall. The Latin poems of URBAN, which are not without a conſiderable portion of wit and elegance, have paſſed through ſeveral editions. ☞ Theſe poems were compoſed while he was yet a cardinal. After his elevation to the pontificate, he publiſhed a remarkable edition of the *Romiſh Breviary*, and ſeveral *Bulls*; among which, that which aboliſhes the Order of *Female Jeſuits*, and certain feſtivals, thoſe relating to image-worſhip and to the condemnation of JANSENIUS's *Auguſtinus*, and that which confers the title of *Eminence* upon the cardinal-legates, the three eccleſiaſtical electors, and the grand maſter of *Malta*, are the moſt worthy of notice.

The

☞ [e] This Donna OLYMPIA MALDACHINI was his brother's widow, with whom he had lived, in an illicit commerce, before his elevation to the pontificate, in which his *Holineſs* continued afterwards.

[f] See the *Memoires du Cardinal de Rhetz*, tom. iii. p. 102. tom. iv. p. 12. of the laſt edition publiſhed at *Geneva*.—For an account of the diſputes between this pontif and the French, ſee BOUGEANT, *Hiſtoire de la paix de Weſtphalie*, tom. iv. p. 56.

[g] See *Memoires du Cardinal de Rhetz*, tom. iv. p. 16. 77. —*Memoires de M. Joly*, tom. ii. p. 186. 210. 237.—ARCKENHOLTZ, *Memoires de la Reine Chriſtine*, tom. ii. p. 125. The craft and diſſimulation attributed to this pontif really conſtituted an eſſential part of his character; but it is not ſtrictly true that he was a man *of a mean genius*, or unequal to *great and difficult undertakings*. He was a man of learning, and diſcovered very eminent abilities at the treaty of *Munſter*, where

he

The two CLEMENTS IX. and X., who were elected ſucceſſively to the papacy in the years 1668 and 1669, were concerned in few tranſactions that deſerve to be tranſmitted to poſterity [h]. This was not the caſe of BENEDICT ODESCHALCHI, who is known in the liſt of pontifs by the denomination of INNOCENT XI., and was raiſed to that high dignity in the year 1677 [i]. This reſpectable pontif acquired a very high and permanent reputation by the auſterity of his morals, his uncommon courage and reſolution, his diſlike of the groſſer ſuperſtitions that reigned in the Romiſh church, his attempts to reform the manners of the clergy, and to aboliſh a conſiderable number of thoſe fictions and frauds that diſhonour their miniſtry, and alſo, by other ſolid and eminent virtues. But it appeared manifeſtly by his example, that thoſe pontifs, who reſpect truth, and act from virtuous and Chriſtian principles, may, indeed, form noble plans, but will never be able to bring them into execution, or at

---

he was ſent in the character of Nuncio. Some writers relate, that while he was in *Germany*, he had formed the deſign of abjuring Popery, and embracing the Proteſtant Religion; but was deterred from the execution of this purpoſe by the example of his couſin, Count POMPEY, who was poiſoned at *Lyons*, on his way to *Germany*, after he had abjured the Romiſh faith. Theſe writers add, that CHIGI was confirmed in his religion by his elevation to the cardinalſhip. See BAYLE, *Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lettres*, Octob. 1688.

☞ [h] CLEMENT IX. was of the family of *Roſpiglioſi*, and the family-name of CLEMENT X. was *Altieri*, ſee *Memoires de la Reine Chriſtine*, tom. ii. p. 126. 131. There are upon record ſeveral tranſactions of CLEMENT IX. that do him honour, and prove his diſlike of nepotiſm, and his love of peace and juſtice.

☞ [i] Some maintain, and with the ſtrongeſt appearance of truth, that this pontif had formerly been a ſoldier, though this report is treated as groundleſs by Count TURREZONICO, in his diſſertation *De ſuppoſititiis militaribus Stipendiis Bened. Odeſchalchi*. See an intereſting account of this pontif in BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article INNOCENT XI.

110769

leaſt to give them that meaſure of ſtability and perfection, which is the object of their wiſhes. By his example and adminiſtration it appeared, that the wiſeſt inſtitutions, and the moſt judicious eſtabliſhments, will be unable to ſtand firm, for any conſiderable time, againſt the inſidious ſtratagems or declared oppoſition of a deluded multitude, who are corrupted by the prevalence of licentious morals, whoſe imaginations are impregnated with ſuperſtitious fictions and fables, whoſe credulity is abuſed by pious frauds, and whoſe minds are nouriſhed, or rather amuſed, with vain rites and ſenſeleſs ceremonies [*k*]. Be that as it may, all the wiſe and ſalutary regulations of INNOCENT XI. were ſuffered to go almoſt to ruin by the criminal indolence of PETER OTTOBONI, who was raiſed to the head of the Romiſh church in the year 1689, and aſſumed the name of ALEXANDER VIII. A laudable attempt was made to revive them by INNOCENT XII., a man of uncommon merit and eminent talents, whoſe name was PIGNATELLI, and who, in the year 1691, ſucceeded ALEXANDER in the papal chair; nor were his zealous endeavours abſolutely deſtitute of ſucceſs. But it was alſo his fate to learn, by experience, that the moſt prudent and reſolute pontifs are unequal to ſuch an arduous taſk, ſuch an Herculean labour, as the reformation of the church and court of *Rome*; nor were the fruits of this good pope's wiſe adminiſtration enjoyed long after his deceaſe [*l*]. The pontif, whoſe reign concluded this century, was JOHN FRANCIS ALBANI, who was raiſed to the head of the Romiſh church in the year 1699, and aſſumed the name of CLEMENT XI. He ſurpaſſed in learning the whole college of cardinals, and was inferior to none of the preceding pontifs in ſagacity, lenity, and a deſire, at leaſt, to govern well; but he was very far from oppoſing, with a proper degree of vigour and reſolution, the inveterate corruptions and ſuperſtitious obſervances of the church over which he preſided; on the contrary, he inconſiderately aimed at, what he thought, the honour and advantage of the church (that is, the glory and intereſt of its pontif) by meaſures that proved detrimental to both, and thus ſhewed, in a ſtriking example, that popes, even of the beſt ſort, may fall imperceptibly into the greateſt miſtakes, and commit the moſt pernicious blunders, through an imprudent zeal for extending their juriſdiction, and augmenting the influence and luſtre of their ſtation [*m*].

[*k*] See *Journal Univerſal*, tom. i. p. 441. tom. vi. p. 306. The preſent Pope BENEDICT XIV.* attempted, in the year 1743, the *canonization* of INNOCENT XI.; but the King of *France*, inſtigated by the Jeſuits, has always oppoſed this deſign, and that more eſpecially on account of the miſunderſtandings that always ſubſiſted between LEWIS XIV. and INNOCENT, of which more hereafter.

* This note was written during the life of BENEDICT XIV.

[*l*] For an account of the character, morals, and election, of INNOCENT XII., ſee the *Letters* of Cardinal NORIS, publiſhed in the fifth volume of his *Works*, p. 362. 365.

[*m*] In the year 1752, there appeared at *Padua*, a Life of CLEMENT XI., compoſed in French, by the learned and eloquent Mr. LAFITAU, Biſhop of *Siſteron*, in two volumes 8vo. The ſame year Mr. REBOULET, Chancellor of *Avignon*, publiſhed in two volumes in 4to, his *Hiſtoire de Clement* XI. Theſe two productions, and more eſpecially the latter, are written with uncommon elegance; but they both abound with hiſtorical errors, which the French writers, in general, are at too little pains to avoid. Beſides, they are both compoſed rather in the ſtrain of panegyric than of hiſtory. An attentive reader will, however, ſee without pain, even in theſe panegyrics, that CLEMENT XI., notwithſtanding his acknowledged ſagacity and prudence, took ſeveral raſh and inconſiderate ſteps, in order to augment the power, and multiply the prerogatives of the Roman pontifs: and thus, through his own temerity, involved himſelf in various perplexities.

II. The

The attempts made by the church of *Rome*, to oppreſs the Proteſtants and ruin their cauſe.

II. The incredible pains that were taken by the pontifs and clergy of the Romiſh Church, to ſpread their doctrine and to erect their dominion among the nations that lay in the darkneſs of Paganiſm, have been already mentioned. We are, therefore, at preſent, to confine our narration to the ſchemes they laid, the cabals they formed, and the commotions they excited, with an uninterrupted and miſchievous induſtry, in order to recover the poſſeſſions and prerogatives they had loſt in *Europe*, to oppreſs the Proteſtants, and to extinguiſh the light of the glorious Reformation. Various were the ſtratagems and projects they formed for theſe purpoſes. The reſources of genius, the force of arms, the ſeduction of the moſt alluring promiſes, the terrors of the moſt formidable threatenings, the ſubtle wiles of controverſy, the influence of pious, and often of impious frauds, the arts of diſſimulation, in ſhort, all poſſible means, fair and diſingenuous, were employed for the deſtruction of the Reformed churches, but in moſt caſes without ſucceſs. The plan of a dreadful attack upon the friends of the Reformation had been, for ſome time, laid in ſecret, and the bigoted and perſecuting houſe of *Auſtria* was pitched upon to put it in execution. However, as injuſtice is ſeldom ſo inſolent as not to ſeek for ſome pretexts to maſk, or at leaſt to diminiſh, its deformity, ſo the church of *Rome* endeavoured beforehand to juſtify the perſecution of which the flame was ready to break out. For this purpoſe the pens of the perfidious and learned SCIOPPIUS [n], of the Jeſuits TANNER, POSSEVIN,

HAGER,

☞ [n] SCIOPPIUS ſeems rather to merit the titles of *malevolent* and *furious* than that of *perfidious*, unleſs his turning papiſt be conſidered by Dr. MOSHEIM as an inſtance of perfidy. This is the intemperate and odious ſatyriſt who was caned by the ſervants of the Engliſh ambaſſador at *Madrid*, for the invectives he had thrown out againſt King JAMES I., in a book which was burnt by the hands of the common hangman at *Paris*.

HAGER, HEDERIC, and FORER, juriſts of *Dilligen*, were employed to repreſent the treaty of peace, made between CHARLES V. and the Proteſtants of *Germany*, as unjuſt, null, and even rendered void by the Proteſtants themſelves, by their departing from, or at leaſt perverting, by various changes and modifications, the confeſſion of *Augſburg* [o]. This injurious charge was proved groundleſs by ſeveral Lutheran doctors, who, of their own accord, defended their communion againſt this inſtance of popiſh calumny; but it was alſo refuted by public authority, even by the expreſs order of JOHN GEORGE, elector of *Saxony*. The taſk was committed to MATTHEW HOE, who, in the years 1628 and 1631, publiſhed, in two volumes, an accurate and laborious defence of the Proteſtants, entitled, *Defenſio Pupillæ Evangelicæ*. The mouth of calumny was not ſtopped by theſe performances. The accuſers continued their clamours, multiplied their libels, and had recourſe to the ſuccours of indecent raillery and ſarcaſtical wit to cover, as well as they were able, the ſtriking defects of a bad cauſe. On the other hand the Lutheran writers exerted themſelves in expoſing the ſophiſtry and refuting the arguments and invectives of their adverſaries.

Commotions in *Auſtria* and *Bohemia*.

III. The firſt flames of that religious war, which the Roman pontifs propoſed to carry on by the arms of the Auſtrians and Spaniards, their ſervile and bigotted inſtruments, broke out in *Auſtria*, where, about the commencement of this century, the friends of the Reformation were cruelly perſecuted and oppreſſed by their Roman-Catholic adverſaries [p]. The ſolemn treaties and conventions, by which the religious liberty and civil rights of theſe Proteſtants had been ſecured, were trampled upon and violated in the moſt ſhocking manner; nor had theſe unhappy ſufferers reſolution, vigour, or ſtrength ſufficient to maintain their privileges. The Bohemians, who were involved in the ſame vexations, proceeded in a different manner. Perceiving plainly that the votaries of *Rome* aimed at nothing leſs than to deprive them of that religious liberty that had been purchaſed by the blood of their anceſtors, and ſo lately confirmed to them by an imperial edict, they came to a reſolution of oppoſing force to force, and of taking up arms to defend themſelves againſt a ſet of men whom, in conſequence of the violence they offered to conſcience, they could look upon in no other light than as the enemies of their ſouls. Accordingly a league was formed by the Bohemian Proteſtants, and they began to avenge, with a great ſpirit and reſolution, the injuries that had been committed againſt their perſons, their families, their religion, and their civil rights and privileges. But it muſt be confeſſed, that, in this juſt attempt to defend what was dear to them as men and Chriſtians, they loſt ſight of the dictates of equity and moderation, and carried their reſentment beyond the bounds both of reaſon and religion. Their adverſaries were ſtruck with terror at a view of their intrepidity, but were not diſmayed. The Bohe-

---

[o] See CHRIST. AUG. SALIG, *Hiſtor. Auguſt. Confeſſionis*, tom. i. lib. iv. cap. iii. p. 768.

[p] RAUPACHIUS, in his *Auſtria Evangelica* (a German work with a Latin title), has given an accurate account of this perſecution

---

perſecution and theſe commotions. The ſame learned and worthy author had formed the deſign of publiſhing an authentic and circumſtantial relation of the ſufferings of the Proteſtants in *Stiria*, *Moravia*, and *Carinthia*, with an account of the perfidious ſnares that were laid for them, the whole drawn from unexceptionable records; but death prevented the execution of this deſign.

mians, therefore, apprehending ſtill further oppoſition and vexations from bigotry, animated by a ſpirit of vengeance, renewed their efforts to provide for their ſecurity. The death of the emperor MATTHIAS, which happened in the year 1619, furniſhed them, as they thought, a fair opportunity of ſtriking at the root of the evil, and removing the ſource of their calamities, by chooſing a ſovereign of the reformed religion; for they conſidered themſelves as authorized by the ancient laws and cuſtoms of the kingdom, to reject any that pretended to the throne by virtue of an hereditary right, and to demand a prince, whoſe title to the crown ſhould be derived from the free ſuffrages of the ſtates. Accordingly FREDERICK V., elector Palatine, who profeſſed the Reformed religion, was, in the year 1619, choſen king of *Bohemia*, and ſolemnly crowned at *Prague* [q].

The Bohemian war; Frederic V.

IV. This bold ſtep, from which the Bohemians expected ſuch ſignal advantages, proved to them a ſource of complicated misfortunes. Its conſequences were fatal to their new ſovereign, and to their own liberties and privileges; for by it they were involved in the moſt dreadful calamities, and deprived of the free exerciſe of the Proteſtant religion, the ſecurity of which was the ultimate end of all the meaſures they had purſued. FREDERIC was defeated, before *Prague*, by the imperial army, in the year 1620, and by this unfortunate battle was not only deprived of his new crown, but alſo of his hereditary dominions. Reduced thus to the wretched condition of an exile, he was obliged to leave his fruitful territories and his ample treaſures to the mercileſs diſcretion of the Auſtrians and Bavarians, who plundered and ravaged them with the moſt rapacious barbarity. The defeat of this unfortunate prince was attended with dreadful conſequences to the Bohemians, and more eſpecially to thoſe who, from a zeal for religious liberty and the intereſts of the Reformation, had embarked in his cauſe. Some of them were committed to a perpetual priſon, others baniſhed for life; ſeveral had their eſtates and poſſeſſions confiſcated; many were put to death; and the whole nation was obliged, from that fatal period, to embrace the religion of the victor, and bend their unwilling necks under the yoke of *Rome.* The triumph of the Auſtrians would neither have been ſo ſudden nor ſo complete, nor would they have been in a condition to impoſe ſuch rigorous and deſpotic terms on the Bohemians, had they not been powerfully aſſiſted by JOHN GEORGE I., elector of *Saxony*, who, partly from a principle of hatred towards the *Reformed* [r], and partly from conſiderations of a political kind, reinforced with his troops, the imperial army [s]. This invaſion of the Palatinate was

---

[q] Beſides CAROLI and JAGERUS, who have compoſed the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of this Century, ſee BURCH. GOTTH. STRUVII *Syntagma Hiſtoriæ Germanicæ*, p. 1487. 1510. 1523. 1538.; as alſo the writers which he recommends. See alſo the *Hiſtoire de* LOUIS XIII., compoſed by the learned and accurate LE VASSOR, tom. iii. p. 223.

☞ [r] By the *Reformed*, as has been already obſerved, we are to underſtand the *Calviniſts*, and alſo, in general, all Proteſtants that are not of the *Lutheran* perſuaſion. And here we ſee a Lutheran elector drawing his ſword to ſupport the cauſe of popery and perſecution againſt a people generouſly ſtruggling for the Proteſtant Religion, and the rights of conſcience.

[s] See the *Commentarii de Bello Bohemico-Germanico, ab A. C.* 1617 *ad A.* 1630, in 4to.—ABRAHAM SCULTET, *Narratio Apologetica de Curriculo Vitæ ſuæ*, p. 86.—It is well known, that the Roman Catholics, and more eſpecially MARTIN BECAN, a Jeſuit, perſuaded MATTHEW HOE, who was an Auſtrian by birth, and the elector's chaplain, to repreſent to his prince the cauſe of the Elector Palatine (which was the cauſe of the *Reformed* Religion) as not only unjuſt, but alſo as detrimental to the intereſts of *Lutheraniſm*, and to recommend to

was the occaſion of that long and bloody war, that was ſo fatal to *Germany*, and in which the greateſt part of the princes of *Europe* were, one way or another, unhappily engaged. It began by a confederacy formed between ſome German powers and the king of *Denmark*, in order to aſſert the rights of the elector Palatine, unjuſtly excluded from his dominions, againſt the deſpotic proceedings of the emperor. The confederates maintained, that the invaſion of *Bohemia*, by this unhappy prince, was no juſt ſubject of offence to the emperor; and that the houſe of *Auſtria*, whoſe quarrel the emperor was not obliged by any means to adopt, was alone the ſufferer in this caſe. However that may have been, the progreſs and iſſue of the war were unfavourable to the allies.

The progreſs of the German or Bohemian war.

V. The ſucceſs of the imperial arms filled the votaries of Popery and *Rome* with the warmeſt tranſports of joy and exultation, and preſented to their imaginations the moſt flattering proſpects. They thought that the happy period was now approaching, when the whole tribe of heretics, that had withdrawn their necks from the papal yoke, ſhould either periſh by the ſword, or be reduced under the dominion of the church. The emperor himſelf ſeemed to have imbibed no ſmall portion of this odious ſpirit, which was doubly prepared, to convert or to deſtroy. The flame of ambition that burned within him, was nouriſhed by the ſuggeſtions of bigotry. Hence he au-

---

to him the cauſe and intereſts of the Houſe of *Auſtria*. See *Unſchuldige Nachricht*, A. 1747. p. 858. ☞ What Dr. MOSHEIM obſerves here may be true; but then it is as true, that MATTHEW HOE muſt have been a great fool, or a great knave, to liſten to ſuch inſinuations, not only on account of their glaring abſurdity, but alſo conſidering the perſons from whom they came. This is the ſame HOE that is mentioned above as a learned defender of the Lutheran faith.

daciouſly carried his arms through a great part of *Germany*, ſuffered his generals to vex with impunity thoſe princes and ſtates which refuſed a blind obedience to the court of *Rome*, and ſhewed plainly, by all his proceedings, that a ſcheme had been laid for the extinction of the Germanic liberty, civil and ſacred. The elector of *Saxony*'s zealous attachment to the emperor, which he had abundantly diſcovered by his warm and ungenerous oppoſition to the unfortunate FREDERIC, together with the lamentable diſcord that reigned among the German princes, perſuaded the papal faction, that the difficulties which ſeemed to oppoſe the execution of their project, were far from being invincible. Accordingly the perſons concerned in this grand enterpriſe began to act their reſpective parts. In the year 1629, FERDINAND II., to give ſome colour of juſtice to this religious war, iſſued out the terrible *reſtitution-edict*, by which the Proteſtants were ordered to reſtore to the church of *Rome* all the poſſeſſions they had become maſters of in conſequence of the *religious peace*, concluded in the preceding century [*t*]. This edict was principally owing to the ſuggeſtions of the Jeſuits. That greedy and ambitious Order claimed a great part of theſe goods and poſſeſſions as a recompence due to their labours in the cauſe of religion; and hence aroſe a warm conteſt between them and the ancient and real proprietors [*u*]. This conteſt indeed was decided by the law of force. It was the depopulating ſoldier, who, ſword in hand, gave weight and authority to the imperial edict, wreſting out of the hands of the lawful poſſeſſor, without form of proceſs, whatever the Romiſh prieſts and monks thought proper to claim, and treating the innocent and plundered ſufferers with all the ſeverity that the moſt barbarous ſpirit of oppreſſion and injuſtice could ſuggeſt [v].

[*t*] See for an illuſtration of this matter, the authors mentioned by STRUVIUS, in his *Syntagma Hiſtor. Germaniæ* p. 1553.

[*u*] See CHRIST. AUG. SALIG, *Hiſtor. Auguſt. Confeſſionis* tom. i. lib. iv. cap. iii. § xxv. p. 810.

Guſtavus Adolphus intervenes.

The concluſion of the thirty years war.

VI. *Germany* groaned under theſe diſmal ſcenes of tumult and oppreſſion, and looked about for ſuccour in vain. The enemy encompaſſed her on all ſides, and none of her princes ſeemed qualified to ſtand forth as the avenger of her injuries, or the aſſertor of her rights. Some were reſtrained from appearing in her cauſe by the ſuggeſtions of bigotry, others by a principle of fear, and others again by an ungenerous attention to their own private intereſt, which choked in their breaſts all concern for the public good. An illuſtrious hero, whoſe deeds even envy was obliged to revere, and whoſe name will deſcend with glory to the lateſt ages, came forth, nevertheleſs, at this critical ſeaſon; GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS took the field, and maintained the cauſe of the Germanic liberties againſt the oppreſſion and

---

☞ [v] When the conſequences of theſe iniquitous and barbarous proceedings were repreſented to this Emperor, and he was aſſured that the country muſt be utterly ruined, in caſe the Bohemians, rendered deſperate by his enormous cruelty and oppreſſion, ſhould exert themſelves in defence of their liberties, and endeavour to repel force by force; he is reported to have anſwered, with great zeal and calmneſs, *Malumus regnum vaſtatum, quàm damnatum.* See the *Hiſtoria Perſecutionum Eccleſiæ Bohemicæ*, &c. p. 152. a work publiſhed (probably in *Holland*, as would ſeem by the type) in the year 1648, in 24to. This little book contains an ample recital of the deplorable effects of lawleſs power, in human bigotry and blood-thirſty zeal; and proves, by numberleſs facts, that Dr. MOSHEIM had the ſtrongeſt evidences for the account he gives of FERDINAND and his miſſionaries. It is impoſſible to reflect upon the ſanguinary manner of ſuch converters, without expreſſing, at the ſame time, a generous deteſtation and abhorrence of their unjuſt and violent proceedings. N.

tyranny of the houſe of *Auſtria*. At the earneſt requeſt of the French court, which beheld, with uneaſineſs, the overgrown power of that aſpiring houſe, he ſet ſail for *Germany*, in the year 1629, with a ſmall army; and, by his repeated victories, blaſted, in a ſhort time, the ſanguine hopes which the pope and emperor had entertained of ſuppreſſing the Proteſtant religion in the empire. Theſe hopes, indeed, ſeemed to revive in the year 1632, when this glorious aſſertor of Germanic liberty fell in the battle of *Lützen* [w]; but this unſpeakable loſs was, in ſome meaſure, made up in proceſs of time, by the conduct of thoſe who ſucceeded GUSTAVUS at the head of the Swediſh army. And, accordingly, the war was obſtinately carried on in bleeding *Germany*, during many years, with various ſucceſs, until the exhauſted treaſures of the contending parties, and the pacific inclinations of CHRISTINA, the daughter and ſucceſſor of GUSTAVUS, put an end to theſe deſolations, and brought on a treaty of peace.

The peace of *Weſtphalia*.

VII. Thus, after a war of thirty years, carried on with the moſt unrelenting animoſity and ardour, the wounds of *Germany* were cloſed, and the drooping ſtates of *Europe* were revived, in the year 1648, by the peace of *Weſtphalia*, ſo called from the cities of *Munſter* and *Oſnaburg*, where the negociations were held, and that famous treaty concluded. The Proteſtants, indeed, did not derive from this treaty all the privileges they claimed, nor all the advantages they had in view;

---

[w] See ARCKENHOLTZ, *Memoires de la Reine Chriſtine*, tom. i. p. 7—20. in which there are many very intereſting anecdotes relating to the life, exploits, and death, of GUSTAVUS. The learned compiler of theſe *Memoirs* has alſo thrown much light upon this period, and of the peace that terminated this long and dreadful war.

for the emperor, among other leſs important inſtances of obſtinacy, abſolutely refuſed to reinſtate the Bohemian and Auſtrian Proteſtants in their religious privileges, or to reſtore the *Upper Palatinate* to its ancient and lawful proprietor. But they, nevertheleſs, obtained by this peace, privileges and advantages which the votaries of *Rome* beheld with much diſpleaſure and uneaſineſs; and it is unqueſtionably evident, that the treaty of *Weſtphalia* gave a new and remarkable degree of ſtability to the Lutheran and Reformed churches in *Germany*. By this treaty the peace of *Augſburg*, which the Lutherans had obtained from CHARLES V. in the preceding century, was firmly ſecured againſt all the machinations and ſtratagems of the court of *Rome*; by it the *reſtitution-edict*, which commanded the Proteſtants to reſtore to the Romiſh church the eccleſiaſtical revenues and lands they had taken poſſeſſion of after that peace, was abrogated, and both the contending parties confirmed in the perpetual and uninterrupted poſſeſſion of whatever they had occupied in the beginning of the year 1624. It would be entering into a very long detail, were we to enumerate the advantages that accrued to the Proteſtant princes from this treaty [x]. All this was

[x] An account of this whole matter, ſufficient to ſatisfy the curioſity of the moſt inquiſitive reader, may be found in that moſt elaborate and excellent work, compiled by the very learned and judicious JOHN GODFRY DE MEYERN, under the following title: *Acta Pacis Weſtphalicæ et Executionis ejus Norimbergenſis*. See alſo the more compendious, though valuable work of ADAMI, Biſhop of *Hierapolis*, entitled, *Relatio Hiſtorica de Pacificatione Oſnabrugo Monaſterienſi*; of which the illuſtrious author publiſhed a new edition at *Leipſick*, in the year 1737, more accurate and ample than the preceding one. We muſt not omit here the ingenious Father BOUGEANT's elegant hiſtory of this treaty, which, though chiefly drawn from the papers of the French ambaſſadors, is, nevertheleſs, generally ſpeaking, compoſed with accuracy, impartiality, and candour: it was publiſhed at *Paris*, in the year 1746, in ſix volumes in 8vo, under the title of *Hiſtoire de la Paix de Weſtphalie*.

a ſource of vexation to the court of *Rome*, and made its pontif feel the ſevereſt pangs of diſappointed ambition. He, accordingly, uſed various ſtratagems, without being very ſcrupulous in the choice, in order to annul this treaty, or elude its effects; but his attempts were unſucceſsful, ſince neither the emperor, nor the princes that had embarked in this cauſe, thought it adviſeable to involve themſelves anew in the tumults of war, whoſe iſſue is ſo uncertain, and whoſe moſt fatal effects they had lately eſcaped with ſo much difficulty. The treaty, therefore, was executed in all its parts; and all the articles that had been agreed upon at *Munſter* and *Oſnaburg* were confirmed and ratified, in the year 1650, at *Nuremberg* [*y*].

The Proteſtants vexed and perſecuted by *Rome* and its votaries.

VIII. After this period, the Court of *Rome* and its creatures were laid under a conſiderable degree of reſtraint. They did not any longer dare to make war in an open and public manner upon the Proteſtants, ſince the preſent ſtate of things blaſted all the hopes they had fondly entertained of extinguiſhing the light of the reformation, by deſtroying or reducing under their ghoſtly yoke the princes and ſtates that had encouraged and protected it in their territories. But whereever they could exert the ſpirit of perſecution with impunity, there they oppreſſed the Proteſtants in the moſt grievous manner, and, in defiance of the moſt ſolemn conventions and of the moſt ſacred obligations, encroached upon their rights, privileges, and poſſeſſions. Thus in *Hungary*, during the ſpace of ten years [z], both Lutherans and Calviniſts were involved in an uninterrupted ſeries of the moſt cruel calamities and vexations [a]. The injuries and inſults they ſuffered at the hands of many orders of men, and more eſpecially of the Jeſuits, both before and after the period now under conſideration, are not to be numbered. In *Poland*, all thoſe who ventured to differ from the Pope, found, by a bitter experience, during the whole courſe of this century, that no treaty or convention that tended to ſet bounds to the authority or rapacity of the church, was held ſacred or even regarded at *Rome*. For many of theſe were ejected out of their ſchools, deprived of their churches, robbed of their goods and poſſeſſions under a variety of perfidious pretexts; nay, frequently condemned to the moſt ſevere and cruel puniſhments, without having been even chargeable with the appearance of a crime [b]. The remains of the Waldenſes, that lived in the vallies of *Piedmont*, were perſecuted often with the moſt inhuman cruelty (and more eſpecially in the years 1632, 1655, and 1685), on account of their magnanimous and ſtedfaſt attachment to the religion of their anceſtors; and this perſecution was carried on with all the horrors of fire and ſword by the Dukes of *Savoy* [c].

[*y*] Pope INNOCENT X. oppoſed to this treaty of peace, in the year 1651, a flaming *Bull;* on which HORNBECK publiſhed at *Utrecht*, in 1652, an ample and learned commentary, entitled, *Examen Bullæ Papalis, quâ Innocentius X. abrogare nititur Pacem Germaniæ.* This *Bull* might, perhaps, have produced ſome effect upon the Emperor and his allies, had it been properly *gilded.*

---

[z] From 1671 to 1681.

[a] See *Hiſtoria Diplomatica de Statu Religionis Evangelicæ in Hungariâ*, p. 69.—PAULI DEBREZENI *Hiſtoria Eccleſiæ Reformatæ in Hungariâ*, lib. ii. p. 447.—SCHELHORNIUS, *in Muſeo Helvetico*, tom. vii. p. 46—90.

[b] See AD. REGENVOLSCHII *Hiſtoria Eccleſiæ Sclavoniæ*, lib. ii. cap. xv. p. 216. 235. 253.—The grievances which the *Diſſenters* from the Church of *Rome* ſuffered in *Poland* after REGENVOLSCIUS, may be learned from various *Memorials* that have been publiſhed in our times.

[c] See GILLES *Hiſtoire Eccleſiaſtique des Egliſes Vaudoiſes*, publiſhed at *Geneva* in 4to, in the year 1656, chap. xlviii. p. 339.

In *Germany*, the ſame ſpirit of bigotry and perſecution produced almoſt every where flagrant acts of injuſtice. The infractions of the famous treaty above mentioned, and of the Germanic liberty that was founded upon it, would furniſh matter for many volumes [*d*]; and all theſe infractions were owing to a prepoſterous and extravagant zeal for augmenting the authority, and extending the juriſdiction, of the Church of *Rome*. And, indeed, as long as that church and its aſſuming pontif ſhall perſiſt in maintaining that they have a right to extend their lordly ſceptre over all the churches of the Chriſtian world, ſo long muſt thoſe who have renounced their authority, but are more or leſs within their reach, deſpair of enjoying the ineſtimable bleſſings of ſecurity and peace. They will always be conſidered as rebellious ſubjects, againſt whom the greateſt acts of ſeverity and violence are lawful.

The Moors baniſhed out of *Spain* and the Proteſtants perſecuted in *France*.

IX. The zealous inſtruments of the Court of *Rome* accompliſhed, at length, in this century, what had often been attempted without ſucceſs, by delivering *Spain* from the infidelity of the Moors, and *France* from the hereſy of the Proteſtants. The poſterity of the Moors or Saracens, who had formerly been maſters of a great part of *Spain*, had hitherto lived in that kingdom mixed with the other inhabitants of the country, and their number was ſtill conſiderable. They were Chriſtians, at leaſt in their external profeſſion and manners; induſtrious alſo, and inoffenſive; and, upon the whole, good and uſeful ſubjects: But they were groſsly ſuſpected of a ſecret propenſity to the doctrine of MAHOMET, which was the religion of their anceſtors. Hence the clergy beſet the monarch with their importunate ſolicitations, and never ceaſed their clamorous remonſtrances before a royal edict was obtained to drive the Saracens, whoſe numbers were prodigious, out of the Spaniſh territories. This imprudent ſtep was highly detrimental to the kingdom of *Spain*, and its pernicious effects are more or leſs viſible even at the preſent times; but the church, whoſe intereſts and dominion are, in Popiſh countries, conſidered as diſtinct from the intereſts and authority of ſtate, and of a much more ſublime and excellent nature, acquired new acceſſions of wealth and power by the expulſion of the Moors [e]. In proportion as the community loſt, the church gained; and thus the public good was ſacrificed to the demands of bigotry and ſuperſtition.

[*d*] The *Hiſtories* of the grievances ſuffered by the Proteſtants of *Germany* on account of their religion, that have been compoſed by STRUVIUS and HOFFMAN, contain ample details of this matter.

In *France*, the perſecuting ſpirit of the Church of *Rome* exhibited ſcenes ſtill more ſhocking. The Proteſtants of that kingdom, commonly called *Huguenots*, after having groaned, for a long ſpace of time, under various forms of cruelty and oppreſſion, and ſeen multitudes of their brethren put to death, by ſecret conſpiracies or open tyranny and violence, were, at length, obliged either to ſave themſelves by a clandeſtine flight, or to profeſs, againſt their conſciences, the Romiſh religion. This barbarous and iniquitous ſcene of French perſecution, than which the annals of modern hiſtory preſent nothing more unnatural and odious, will find its place below, in the hiſtory of the Reformed Church [f].

The court of *Rome* fails in its attempts upon *England*.

X. All the reſources of inventive genius and refined policy, all the efforts of inſinuating craft and audacious rebellion, were employed to bring back *Great Britain* and *Ireland* under the yoke of *Rome*. But all theſe attempts were without effect. About the beginning of this century, a ſet of deſperate and execrable wretches, in whoſe breaſts the ſuggeſtions of bigotry, and the hatred of the Proteſtant religion, had ſuppreſſed all the feelings of juſtice and humanity, were inſtigated by three Jeſuits, of whom GARNET, the ſuperior of the ſociety in *England*, was the chief, to form the moſt horrid plot that is known in the annals of hiſtory. The deſign of this conſpiracy was nothing leſs than to deſtroy, at one blow, JAMES I., the Prince of *Wales*, and both Houſes of Parliament, by the exploſion of an immenſe quantity of gun-powder, which was concealed, for that purpoſe, in the vaults that lay under the Houſe of Lords. The ſanguinary bigots concerned in it imagined, that, as ſoon as this horrible deed was performed, they would be at full liberty to reſtore Popery to its former credit, and ſubſtitute it in the place of the Proteſtant religion*[g]. This odious conſpiracy, whoſe infernal purpoſe was providentially diſcovered, when it was ripe for execution, is commonly known in *Britain* under the denomination of the *gun-powder treaſon* [h].

---

[e] See MICHAEL GEDDES's *Hiſtory of the Expulſion of the Moriſcoes out of Spain*, in his *Miſcellaneous Tracts*, vol. i. p. 59.

[f] In the ſecond chapter of the ſecond part of this ſection.

This diſcovery did not ſuſpend the efforts and ſtratagems of the Court of *Rome*, which carried

---

☞ [g] There is a letter extant, written by Sir EVERARD DIGBY, one of the conſpirators, to his wife, after his condemnation, which deſerves an eminent place in the hiſtory of ſuperſtition and bigotry, and ſhews abundantly their infernal ſpirit and tendency. The following paſſage will confirm this judgment: "*Now for my intention,* ſays DIGBY, *let me tell you,* "*that, if I had thought there had been the leaſt ſin in the plot, I* "*would not have been of it for all the world; and no other cauſe* "*drew me to hazard my fortune and life but zeal to God's reli*"*gion.*" See the *Papers* relating to the Popiſh Plot, publiſhed by the orders of Secretary COVENTRY.

[h] See RAPIN THOYRAS, *Hiſtoire d'Angleterre*, livr. xviii. tom. vii. p. 40.—JO. HENR. HEIDEGGERI *Hiſtoria Papatus*, Period. § vii. p. 211. 291, &c.

on its ſchemes in the ſucceeding reign, but with leſs violence, and more caution. CHARLES I. was a prince of a ſoft and gentle temper, and was entirely directed by the counſels of LAUD, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, a man who was neither deſtitute of learning nor good qualities [*i*], though he carried things to exceſſive and intolerable lengths, through his warm and violent attachment to the ancient rites and ceremonies of the church; the Queen, on the other hand, who was a princeſs of *France*, was warmly devoted to the intereſts of Popery; and from all this it ſeemed probable enough, that, though treaſon and violence had failed, yet artifice and mild meaſures might ſucceed, and that a reconciliation might be brought about between *England* and *Rome* [*j*]. This proſpect, which had ſmiled in the imaginations of the friends of Popery, vaniſhed entirely when the civil war broke out between the King and Parliament. In conſequence of theſe commotions, both the unfortunate CHARLES and his imprudent and bigotted counſellor LAUD were brought to the ſcaffold; and OLIVER CROMWELL, a man of unparalleled reſolution, dexterity, and foreſight, and a declared enemy to every thing that bore even the moſt diſtant reſemblance of popery, was placed at the helm of government, under the title of Protector of the commonwealth of *England*.

The hopes of *Rome* and its votaries were, nevertheleſs, revived by the reſtoration of CHARLES II., and from that period grew more lively and

---

☞ [*i*] Mr. HUME, ſpeaking of LAUD's learning and morals, expreſſes himſelf in the following manner: "This man "was virtuous, if ſeverity of manners alone, and abſtinence "from pleaſure, could deſerve that name. He was learned, "if polemical knowledge could entitle him to that praiſe." See HUME's *Hiſtory of Great Britain*, vol. v. p. 193.

[*j*] See URBAN CERRI, *Etât Preſent de l'Egliſe Romaine*, p. 315.—NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. iii. p. 194.

ſanguine from day to day. For that monarch, as appears from unqueſtionable authorities [k], had been initiated, during his exile, into the myſteries of popery, and had ſecretly embraced that religion, while his only brother, the preſumptive heir to the crown, profeſſed it openly, and had publicly apoſtatized from the Proteſtant faith. CHARLES, indeed, was not a proper inſtrument for the propagation of any theological ſyſtem. Indolent and voluptuous on the one hand, and inclined to infidelity and irreligion on the other, it was not from him that the Roman pontif could expect that zeal and induſtry, that were neceſſary to force upon the Engliſh nation a religion ſo contrary to the tenor of the laws and the ſpirit of the people as popery was [l]. This zeal was found

---

[k] BURNET's *Hiſtory of his own Times*, vol. i. book iii. p. 603. 606.—NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. iv. p. 233. 237. 534.—RAPIN THOYRAS, *Hiſtoire de l'Angleterre*, livr. xxiii. vol. ix. p. 160.

☞ [l] Such is the repreſentation given of CHARLES II. by all hiſtorians; ſo that Dr. MOSHEIM is excuſable in miſtaking a part of this monarch's character, which was known to very few before him. Mr. HUME, whoſe hiſtory of the reign of that prince is a maſter-piece in every reſpect, gave a like account of CHARLES, as fluctuating between Deiſm and Popery. But this eminent hiſtorian having had occaſion, during his reſidence at *Paris*, to peruſe the manuſcript-memoirs of King JAMES II., which were written by himſelf, and are kept in the Scots College there, received from them new information with reſpect to the religious character of CHARLES; and was convinced that his zeal for Popery went much farther than has been generally imagined. For it appears, with the utmoſt evidence, from theſe memoirs, that the King had laid with his miniſtry a formal plan for ſubverting the conſtitution in favour of Popery; that the introduction of Popery, as the eſtabliſhed religion, was the great and principal object which CHARLES had in view when he entered into the French alliance, which was concluded at *Verſailles* in the end of 1669, or beginning of 1670, by Lord ARUNDEL of *Wardour*. By this treaty, LEWIS was to give CHARLES 200,000 pounds a year, in quarterly payments, in order to enable him to eſtabliſh the Roman Catholic religion in *England*; and to ſupply him found in his bigotted ſucceſſor JAMES II.; but it was accompanied with ſuch exceſſive vehemence and imprudence as entirely defeated its own purpoſes; for that inconſiderate monarch, by his paſſionate attachment to the court of *Rome*, and his blind obſequiouſneſs to the unſeaſonable and precipitate counſels of the Jeſuits, who were the oracles of his cabinet, gave a mortal blow to that religion which he meant to promote, and fell from the throne whoſe prerogatives he was attempting to augment and extend. Immediately on his acceſſion to the crown, he openly attempted to reſtore to its former vigour, both in *England* and *Ireland*, the authority of the Roman pontif, which had been renounced and annulled by the laws of both realms; and that he might accompliſh with the more facility this moſt imprudent purpoſe, he trampled upon thoſe rights and privileges of his people, that had ever been held moſt reſpectable and ſacred, and which he had bound himſelf, by the moſt ſolemn engagements, to ſupport and maintain. Juſtly exaſperated and provoked by repeated inſults from the throne upon their religion and liberties, and alarmed with natural apprehenſions of the approaching ruin of both; the Engliſh nation looked about for a deliverer, and fixed its views, in the year 1688, on WILLIAM prince of *Orange*, ſon-in-law to their deſpotic

---

him alſo with 6000 men, in caſe of any inſurrection. The diviſion of the United Provinces between *England* and *France* was another article of this treaty. But we are told, that the ſubverſion of the Proteſtant religion in *England* was the point that CHARLES had chiefly at heart; and that he inſiſted warmly on beginning with the execution of this part of the treaty; but the Ducheſs of *Orleans*, in the interview at *Dover*, perſuaded him to begin with the Dutch war. The King (ſays Mr. HUME) was ſo *zealous a Papiſt*, that he *wept for joy* when he entertained the project of re-uniting his kingdom to the Catholic Church. See the *Corrections and Additions* to Mr. HUME's *Hiſtory of Charles* II., p. 238, in the note.

monarch, by whoſe wiſdom and valour things were ſo conducted, that JAMES was obliged to retire from his dominions and to abdicate the crown; and the Roman pontif, with all his adherents, were diſappointed in the fond expectations they had formed of reſtoring popery in *England* [m].

Milder methods are employed by *Rome* againſt the Proteſtant cauſe.

XI. When the more prudent defenders and patrons of the Romiſh faith perceived the ill ſucceſs that attended all their violent and ſanguinary attempts to eſtabliſh its authority, they thought it expedient to have recourſe to ſofter methods; and inſtead of conquering the Proteſtants by open force, propoſed deluding them back into the church of *Rome* by the inſinuating influence of ſecret artifice. This way of proceeding was approved by many of the votaries of *Rome;* but they were not all agreed about the particular manner of employing it, and therefore followed different methods. Some had recourſe to the appointment of public diſputations or conferences between the principal doctors of the contending parties; and this from a notion, which paſt experience had rendered ſo vain and chimerical, that the adverſaries of popery would either be vanquiſhed in the debate, or at leaſt be perſuaded to look upon the Roman-catholics with leſs averſion and diſguſt. Others declared it as their opinion, that all conteſt was to be ſuſpended; that the great point was to find out the proper method of reconciling the two churches; and that, in order to promote this ſalutary purpoſe, as little ſtreſs as poſſible was to be laid upon thoſe matters of controverſy that had been hitherto looked upon as of the higheſt moment and importance. A different manner of proceeding was thought more adviſeable by a third ſet of men, who, from a perſuaſion that their doctors had more zeal than argument, and were much more eminent for their attachment to the church of *Rome*, than for their ſkill in defending its cauſe, prepared their combatants with greater care for the field of controverſy, taught them a new art of theological war, and furniſhed them with a new and ſubtle method of vanquiſhing, or at leaſt of perplexing, their heretical adverſaries.

---

[m] The circumſtances of this famous and ever memorable revolution are accurately recorded by BURNET, in the ſecond volume of his *Hiſtory of his own Times*; and alſo by RAPIN, in the tenth volume of his *Hiſtory of England.* Add to theſe, NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. iv. ch. xi. p. 536.

Theological conferences held between the doctors of both churches.

XII. There was a famous conference held at *Ratiſbon*, in the year 1601, at the joint deſire of MAXIMILIAN, duke of *Bavaria*, and PHILIP LEWIS, elector *Palatine*, between ſome eminent Lutheran doctors on the one ſide, and three celebrated Jeſuits on the other. The diſpute turned upon the two great points, to which almoſt all the conteſts between the Proteſtants and Roman-catholics are reducible, even the *rule of faith* and the *judge of controverſies*. In the year 1615, a conference was held at *Newburg*, between JAMES HEILBRONNER, a learned Lutheran, and JAMES KELLER, a celebrated Jeſuit, by the appointment of WOLFGANG WILLIAM, prince *Palatine*, who had a little before that time embraced the Romiſh faith. But the moſt famous of all theſe conferences was that held in the year 1645, at *Thorn*, by the expreſs order of ULADISLAUS IV., king of *Poland*, between ſeveral eminent doctors of the Romiſh, Lutheran, and Reformed churches. This meeting, which was deſigned to heal the diviſion that reigned among theſe churches, and to find out ſome method of reconciling their differences, and bringing about their re-union, was thence called the *Charitable Conference*. Some time after this, ERNEST, Landgrave of *Heſſe*, in order to give a plauſible colour to his apoſtaſy from the Proteſtant religion, and make it appear to be the reſult of examination and conviction, obliged Valerianus Magnus, a learned Capuchin, to enter the liſts with Peter Habercorn, a reformed miniſter in the caſtle of *Rheinfeldt*. Beſides theſe public conferences, there were others of a more private nature held, during this century, between the doctors of the contending churches. The moſt remarkable of theſe was the famous diſpute between John Claude, the moſt learned of the Reformed divines in *France*, and Jaques Benigne de Bossuet, whoſe genius and erudition placed him at the head of the Romiſh doctors in that country. This diſpute, which was held in the year 1683, ended like all the reſt. They all widened the breach inſtead of healing it. Neither of the contending parties could be perſuaded to yield [*n*]; on the contrary, they both returned from the field of controverſy more rivetted in their own opinions, and more averſe to thoſe of their adverſaries.

The methods of reconciliation employed by the Roman-catholics.

XIII. Thoſe of the Roman-Catholics, whoſe views were turned towards union and concord, did not omit the uſe of *pious* artifice and ſtratagem, in order to accompliſh this ſalutary purpoſe. They endeavoured to perſuade the zealous Proteſtants and the rigid Catholics, that their differences in opinion were leſs conſiderable, and leſs important, than they themſelves imagined; and that the true way to put an end to their diſſenſions, and to promote their union, was not to nouriſh the flames of diſcord by diſputes and conferences, but to ſee whether their ſyſtems might not be reconciled, and their apparent inconſiſtences removed, by proper and candid explications. They imagined that an artful expoſition of thoſe doctrines of the church of *Rome*, that appeared the moſt ſhocking to the Proteſtants, would tend much to conquer their averſion to Popery. Such was the general principle in which the Romiſh peace-makers agreed, and ſuch the baſis on which they propoſed to carry on their pacific operations; but they differed ſo widely in their manner of applying this general principle, and purſued ſuch different methods in the execution of this nice and perilous ſtratagem, that the event did not anſwer their expectations. In the way they proceeded, inſtead of promoting the deſired union by their repreſentations of things, by their exhortations and counſels, this union ſeemed to be previouſly neceſſary, in order to render their explications and exhortations acceptable, nay even ſupportable; ſo little were the means proportioned to the end!

[*n*] The reader who deſires a more particular account of what paſſed in theſe conferences, may ſatisfy his curioſity by conſulting the writers mentioned by Sagittarius, in his *Introduct. in Hiſtoriam Eccleſiaſt.* tom. ii. p. 1569. 1581. 1592. 1598. An account of the conference between Claude and Bossuet was compoſed and publiſhed by each of theſe famous combatants. Bossuet's account was thus entitled: *Conference avec* M. Claude, *ſur la matiere de l'Egliſe*, Paris 1683, in 12mo. This account was anſwered by Claude, in his *Reſponſe au Livre de* M. De Meaux, *intitulé*, *Conference avec* M. Claude, publiſhed at the *Hague* in 8vo in the year 1683.

The firſt and moſt eminent of thoſe who tried the force of their genius in this arduous enterpriſe was Cardinal RICHELIEU, that great miniſter, who employed all the influence of promiſes and threatenings, all the powers of ſophiſtry and eloquence, all the arts of perſuaſion, in order to bring back the French Proteſtants into the boſom of the Romiſh church [o]. The example of this illuſtrious prelate was followed, but with leſs dignity and leſs influence, by Masenius, a German Jeſuit [*p*], Volusius, a theologiſt of *Mentz* [*q*], Prætorius, a Pruſſian [*r*], Gibbon de Burg, an Iriſh doctor, who was profeſſor at *Erfurth* [*s*], Marcellus, a Jeſuit [*t*], and other divines of inferior note. But of all modern adepts in controverſy, none purſued this method with ſuch dexterity and art as Bossuet, biſhop of *Meaux*, a man of true genius, directed by the moſt conſummate circumſpection and prudence. The famous *Expoſition of the Roman-Catholic Faith*, that was drawn up by this ſubtle and inſinuating author, was deſigned to ſhew the Proteſtants, that their reaſons againſt returning to the boſom of the Romiſh church would be ſoon and eaſily removed, provided they would view the doctrines of that church in their true light, and not as they had been erroneouſly repreſented by the Proteſtant writers [*u*]. This notion was propagated, though

---

[o] RICH. SIMON, *Lettres Choiſies*, tom. i. p. 31, 32. new edit.—BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article AMYRAUT, note I; at the article BEAULIEU, note C; at the article FERRY, note D; at the article MILLETIERE.

[*p*] See Frid. Spanhemii *Strictura ad* Bossueti *Expoſitionem Fidei Catholicæ*, tom. iii. opp. *Theolog.* par. II. p. 1042.

[*q*] There is extant a book compoſed by this writer under the following title: *Aurora Pacis religioſæ divinæ Veritati amica. Mogunt.* 1665, 4to.

[*r*] In his *Tuba Pacis*, of which the reader may ſee a curious account in Bayle's *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for the year 1685, p. 1309.

[*s*] In a treatiſe, entitled, *Luthero Calviniſmus ſchiſmaticus quidem ſed reconciliabilis.*

[*t*] The book of Marcellus, entitled, *Sapientia pacifica*, was refuted by Seldius, at the expreſs deſire of the Duke of *Saxe-Gotha*.

[*u*] This book might furniſh ſubject for a multitude of reflections. See a particular account of its hiſtory and its effects in Pfaff's *Hiſtoria Literaria Theologiæ*, tom. ii. p. 102.; and Le Clerc's *Bibliotheque Univerſelle et Hiſtorique*, tom. xi. p. 438. ☞ It is remarkable, that nine years paſſed before this book could obtain the Pope's approbation. Clement X. refuſed it poſitively. Nay, ſeveral Roman Catholic prieſts were rigorouſly treated, and ſeverely perſecuted, for preaching the doctrine contained in the expoſition of Bossuet, which was,

with leſs dexterity and ſucceſs, by Dezius, a Jeſuit of *Straſburg*, who wrote a book expreſsly to prove, that there was little or no difference between the doctrine of the council of *Trent*, and that of the confeſſion of *Augſburg*, than which no two ſyſtems can be more irreconcilably oppoſite [w]. It is however remarkable, that all theſe pacific attempts to re-unite the two churches, were made by the perſons now mentioned, on

---

moreover, formally condemned by the Univerſity of *Louvain*, in the year 1685, and declared to be *ſcandalous* and *pernicious*. The Sorbonne alſo diſavowed the doctrine contained in that book, though by a late edict we learn, that the fathers of that theological ſeminary have changed their opinion on that head, and thus given a new inſtance of the *variations* that reign in the Romiſh Church, which boaſts ſo much of its uniformity in doctrinal matters. The artifice that was employed in the compoſition of this book, and the tricks that were uſed in the ſuppreſſion and alteration of the firſt edition that was given of it, have been detected with great ſagacity and evidence by the learned and excellent Archbiſhop Wake, in the *Introduction* to his *Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, &c.* See alſo his two *Defences* of that *Expoſition*, in which the perfidious ſophiſtry of Bossuet is unmaſked and refuted in the moſt ſatisfactory manner. There was an excellent anſwer to Bossuet's book publiſhed by M. De La Bastide, one of the moſt eminent Proteſtant miniſters in *France*. This anſwer the French prelate took no notice of during eight years; at the end of which he publiſhed an advertiſement, in a new edition of his *Expoſition*, which was deſigned to remove the objections of La Bastide. The latter replied in ſuch a demonſtrative and victorious manner, that the learned biſhop, notwithſtanding all his eloquence and art, was obliged to quit the field of controverſy. See a very intereſting account of this inſidious work of Bossuet, and the controverſies it occaſioned, in the *Bibliotheque des Sciences*, publiſhed at the *Hague*, vol. xviii. p. 20. This account, which is curious, accurate, ample, and learned, was given partly on occaſion of a new edition of the *Expoſition*, printed at *Paris* in 1761, and accompanied with a Latin tranſlation done by Fleury, and partly on occaſion of Burigny's *Life of Boſſuet*, publiſhed the ſame year at *Paris*.

[w] This book is entitled, *La Re-union des Proteſtans de Straſburg à l'Egliſe Romaine*, publiſhed in 8vo at *Straſburg*, in the year 1689.—See Phil. Jac. Speneri *Conſilia Theol. German.* pars iii. p. 650. 662.

their own private authority; they were not avowed by the higher powers, who alone were qualified to remove, modify, or explain away thoſe doctrines and rites of the Romiſh church, that ſhocked the Proteſtants and juſtified their ſeparation. It is true, indeed, that, in the year 1686, this plan of reconciliation was warmly recommended by a perſon properly commiſſioned, or, at leaſt, who gave himſelf out for ſuch. This pacificator was CHRISTOPHER DE ROHAS, biſhop of *Tinia*, in the diſtrict of *Boſnia*; who, during ſeveral years, frequented, with theſe reconciling views, the courts of the Proteſtant princes in *Germany*; intimated the aſſembling of a new council, that was to be more impartial in its deciſions and leſs reſtrained in its proceedings than the council of *Trent*; nay, went ſtill further, and aſſured the Proteſtants, that they ſhould obtain without difficulty whatever rights, privileges, and immunities, they ſhould think proper to demand from the Roman pontif, provided they would acknowledge his paternal authority, and no longer refuſe a profound ſubmiſſion to his mild and gentle empire. But the artifice and deſigns of this ſpecious miſſionary were eaſily detected; the Proteſtant doctors, and alſo their ſovereigns, ſoon perceived that a fair and candid plan of reconciliation and union was not what the court of *Rome* had in view; but that a ſcheme was laid for reſtoring its pontifs to their former deſpotic dominion over the Chriſtian world [x].

---

[x] See JO. WOLF. JAEGERI *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſt. Sæculi* xvii. —CHRIST. EBERHARDI WEISMANNI *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. Sæculi* xvii. p. 735. The reader will find, in the *Commercium Epiſtolico-Leibnitianum* of GRUBERUS *, an account of the particular conditions of reconciliation that were propoſed, in the year 1660, to the German courts by the Elector of *Mentz*, authorized, as it is alleged, by the Roman pontif.

* Tom. i. p. 411, 415. 426.

Proteſtant peace-makers.

XIV. The Romiſh peace-makers found among the Proteſtants, and more eſpecially among thoſe of the *Reformed* church, certain doctors, who, by a natural propenſity to union and concord, ſeconded perhaps, in ſome, by views of intereſt, or by the ſuggeſtions of ambition, were diſpoſed to enter into their plan, and to aſſiſt them in the execution of it. Theſe doctors maintained, that the points in debate between the two churches were not of ſufficient importance to juſtify their ſeparation. Among the French Proteſtants, LEWIS LE BLANC and his diſciples were ſuſpected of an inclination to go too great lengths in this matter [*y*]. The ſame accuſation was brought, with fuller evidence, againſt HUISSEAUX, profeſſor of divinity at *Saumur*, MILLETIERE, LE FEVRE, and others of leſs note [*z*]. Among the Britiſh divines, this exceſſive propenſity to diminiſh the ſhocking abſurdities of Popery was leſs remarkable; WILLIAM FORBES was the principal perſon who diſcovered an extreme facility to compoſe a conſiderable number of the differences that contributed to perpetuate the ſeparation between the two churches [*a*]. With reſpect to the Dutch, it is abundantly

---

[*y*] See a particular and intereſting account of LE BLANC in BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article BEAULIEU.

[*z*] See the above-mentioned *Dictionary*, at the article MILLETIERE. For an account of HUISSEAUX, and his pacific counſels, ſee RICH. SIMON, *Lettres choiſies*, tom. iii. p. 14.—AYMON, *Synodes Nationaux des Egliſes Reformées en France*, tom. ii. p. 765.—The labours of LE FEVRE, father to the famous Madam DACIER, in the ſame cauſe, are mentioned by MORHOFIUS, in his *Polyhiſtor*. tom. i. p. 295.

[*a*] See FORBES's *Conſiderationes modeſtæ et pacificæ Controverſiarum de Juſtificatione, Purgatorio*, &c. which were publiſhed in 8vo at *London* in the year 1658, and afterwards, more correctly, in *Germany*, under the inſpection of JOHN FABRICIUS, profeſſor of divinity at *Helmſtadt*. FORBES is mentioned by GRABE with the higheſt encomiums, in his *Notæ ad Bulli Harmoniam Apoſtolicam*, p. 19. and, if we conſider his probity, and the exemplary regularity of his life and converſation, he muſt

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I.

abundantly known, how ardently the great and learned GROTIUS deſired the re-union of all Chriſtian churches in one general bond of charity and concord, and with what peculiar zeal he endeavoured to reform ſome enormities of the church of *Rome*, and to excuſe others. But theſe, and all the other arbitrators, whoſe names and whoſe efforts in this pacific cauſe it would be tedious to mention, derived no other fruit from their, perhaps, well-intended labours, than the diſpleaſure of both the contending parties, and the bitter reproaches of their reſpective churches.

In the number of the Proteſtant doctors who diſcovered an inconſiderate zeal for the re-union of theſe churches, many writers place GEORGE CALIXTUS, a man of eminent learning, and profeſſor of divinity in the Univerſity of *Helmſtadt*. It is nevertheleſs certain, that this great man diſcovered and expoſed the errors and corruptions of Popery with a degree of learning and perſpicuity that was ſcarcely ſurpaſſed by any writer of this century, and perſiſted ſtedfaſtly in maintaining, that the decrees and anathemas of the council of *Trent* had baniſhed all hopes of a reconciliation between the Proteſtant churches and the ſee of *Rome*. It is true, indeed, that CALIXTUS looked upon ſome of the controverſies that divided the two communions with much more moderation and indulgence than was uſual, and decided them

---

muſt be allowed to deſerve the praiſe that is due to piety and good morals. Nevertheleſs, he had his infirmities, and the wiſer part of the Engliſh doctors acknowledge, that his propenſity towards a reconciliation with the Church of *Rome* was carried too far. See BURNET's *Hiſtory of his own Times*, vol. i. p. 21.—On this account he has been laviſhly praiſed by the Roman Catholic writers; ſee R. SIMON, *Lettres Choiſies*, tom. iii. lettr. xviii. p. 119.—He was, undoubtedly, one of thoſe who contributed moſt to ſpread among the Engliſh a notion (whoſe truth or falſehood we ſhall not here examine), that King CHARLES I. and Archbiſhop LAUD had formed the deſign of reſtoring Popery in *England*.

in a manner that did not ſeem ſuited to the taſte and ſpirit of the times: he was alſo of opinion, that the church of *Rome* had not deſtroyed the genuine principles of Chriſtianity, but had only deformed them with its ſenſeleſs fictions, and buried them under a heap of rubbiſh, under a motley multitude of the moſt extravagant and intolerable doctrines and ceremonies. It was undoubtedly on this account, that he has been ranked by ſome in the claſs of the imprudent peace-makers already mentioned.

The Popiſh Methodiſts.

XV. It was no difficult matter to defeat the purpoſes and ruin the credit of theſe pacific arbitrators, who, upon the whole, made up but a motley and ill-compoſed ſociety, weakened by inteſtine diſcords. It required more dexterity, and greater efforts of genius, to oppoſe the progreſs, and diſconcert the ſophiſtry of a ſet of men who had invented new methods of defending Popery, and attacking its adverſaries. This new ſpecies of polemic doctors were called *Methodiſts*, and the moſt eminent of them aroſe in *France*, where a perpetual ſcene of controverſy, carried on with the moſt learned among the *Huguenots*, had augmented the dexterity, and improved the theological talents, of the Roman Catholic diſputants. The *Methodiſts*, from their different manner of treating the controverſy in queſtion, may be divided into two claſſes. In the one we may place thoſe doctors whoſe method of diſputing with the Proteſtants was diſingenuous and unreaſonable, and who followed the examples of thoſe military chiefs, who ſhut up their troops in intrenchments and ſtrong holds, in order to cover them from the attacks of the enemy. Such was the manner of proceeding of the Jeſuit VERON, who was of opinion, that the Proteſtants ſhould be obliged to prove the tenets of their church [b] by plain paſ-

---

☞ [b] More eſpecially the doctrines that peculiarly oppoſe the decrees and tenets of the council of *Trent*.

ſages of ſcripture, without being allowed the liberty of illuſtrating theſe paſſages, reaſoning upon them, or drawing any concluſions from them [c]. In the ſame claſs may be ranked NIHUSIUS, an apoſtate from the Proteſtant religion [d], the two WALENBURGS, and other Polemics, who, looking upon it as an eaſier matter to maintain their pretenſions than to ſhew upon what principles they were originally founded [e], obliged their adverſaries to prove all their aſſertions and objections, whether of an affirmative or negative kind, and confined themſelves to the eager buſineſs of anſwering objections and repelling attacks. We may alſo place among this kind of Methodiſts Cardinal RICHELIEU, who judged it the ſhorteſt and beſt way to attend little to the multitude of accuſations, objections, and reproaches, with which the Proteſtants loaded all the various branches of the Romiſh government, diſcipline, doctrine, and worſhip, and to confine the whole controverſy to the ſingle article of the *divine inſtitution* and *authority* of the CHURCH, which he thought it eſſential to eſtabliſh by the ſtrongeſt arguments, as the grand principle that would render Popery impregnable [*f*].

---

[c] MUSÆUS, *De Uſu Principiorum Rationis in Controverſiis Theologicis*, lib. i. c. iv. p. 22.—G. CALIXTI *Digreſſio de Arte nova*, p. 125.—SIMON, *Lettres Choiſies*, tom. i. p. 276.

[d] See a particular account of this vain and ſuperficial doctor in BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article NIHUSIUS. His work, entitled, *Ars Nova dicto Sacræ Scripturæ unico lucrandi a Pontificiis plurimos in partes Lutheranorum detecta*, &c. was refuted, in the moſt ſatisfactory manner, by CALIXTUS, in his *Digreſſio in Arte Nova contra* NIHUSIUM, a curious and learned work, which was publiſhed * in 4to at *Helmſtadt*, in 1634.

☞ [e] That is to ſay, in other words, that they pleaded *preſcription* in favour of Popery, and acted like one who having been, for a long time, in poſſeſſion of an eſtate, refuſes to produce his title, and requires that thoſe who queſtion it ſhould prove its inſufficiency or falſehood.

* This piece originally made a part of the *Theologia Moralis* of CALIXTUS, but was afterwards publiſhed ſeparately.

The *Methodiſts* of the ſecond claſs were of opinion, that the moſt expedient manner of reducing the Proteſtants to ſilence was not to attack them by piecemeal, but to overwhelm them at once, by the weight of ſome general principle or preſumption, ſome univerſal argument, which comprehended, or might be applied to, all the points conteſted between the two churches. They imitated the conduct of thoſe military leaders who, inſtead of ſpending their time and ſtrength in ſieges and ſkirmiſhes, endeavour to put an end to the war by a general and deciſive action. This method, if not invented [*g*], was at leaſt improved and ſeconded by all the aids of eloquence and genius, by NICOLLE, a celebrated doctor among the Janſeniſts [*h*]; and it was followed by many of the diſputants

---

[*f*] For a more ample account of theſe methods of controverſy, and of others uſed by the Church of *Rome*, the curious reader may conſult FRID. SPANHEIM, *Strictur. ad Expoſitionem Fidei Boſſueti*, tom. iii. opp. par. II. p. 1037.—JO. HENR. HEIDEGGER, *Hiſtor. Papatus*, *Period.* vii. § ccxviii. p. 316.—WALCHII *Introduct. ad Controverſ. Theolog.* tom. ii.—WEISMANNI *Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſtica*, Sæc. xvii. p. 726.

☞ [*g*] This method certainly was not the invention of NICOLLE, for it ſeems to differ little, if at all, from the method of Cardinal RICHELIEU. We may obſerve further, that RICHELIEU ſeems rather to belong to the ſecond claſs of Methodiſts than to the firſt, where Dr. MOSHEIM has placed him.

[*h*] NICOLLE is ſuppoſed to be the author of a book, entitled, *Préjugés legitimes contre les Calviniſtes*, which was firſt publiſhed at *Paris* in 1671, paſſed afterwards thro' ſeveral editions, and was anſwered in a ſatisfactory manner by ſeveral learned men. ☞ It is very remarkable, that ſome of the principal arguments employed in this book againſt the Proteſtants are preciſely the ſame that the Deiſts make uſe of to ſhew, that it is impoſſible for the general body of Chriſtians to believe upon a rational foundation. The learned CLAUDE, in his *Defence of the Reformation*, ſhewed, in a demonſtrative manner, that the difficulties ariſing from the incapacity of the multitude to exa-

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I.

diſputants of the church of *Rome*, who were ſo fully perſuaded of its irreſiſtible influence, that they looked upon any one of the general points already mentioned as ſufficient, when properly handled, to overturn the whole Proteſtant cauſe. Hence it was, that ſome of theſe Polemics reſted the defence of Popery upon the ſingle principle of *preſcription;* others upon the vicious lives of ſeveral of thoſe princes who had withdrawn their dominions from the yoke of *Rome;* others again, upon the criminal nature of religious *ſchiſm*, with which they reproached the promoters of the Reformation; and they were all convinced, that, by urging their reſpective arguments, and making good their reſpective charges, the mouths of their adverſaries muſt be ſtopped, and the cauſe of *Rome* and its pontif triumph [*i*]. The famous BOSSUET ſtood foremoſt in this claſs, which he peculiarly adorned, by the ſuperiority of his genius and the inſinuating charms of his eloquence. His arguments, indeed, were more ſpecious than ſolid, and the circumſtances from which they were drawn were imprudently choſen. From the variety of opinions that take place among the Proteſtant doctors, and the changes that have happened in their diſcipline and doctrine, he endeavoured to demonſtrate, that the church founded by LUTHER was not the true church; and, on the other hand, from the perpetual ſameneſs and uniformity

---

mine the grounds and principles of the Proteſtant religion, are much leſs than thoſe which occur to a Papiſt, whoſe faith is founded, not on the plain word of God alone, but on the dictates of tradition, on the decrees of councils, and a variety of antiquated records that are beyond his reach. The Proteſtant divine goes ſtill further, and proves, that there are arguments in favour of Chriſtianity and the Proteſtant faith, that are intelligible by the loweſt capacity, and, at the ſame time, ſufficient to ſatisfy an upright and unprejudiced mind.

[*i*] FRID. SPANHEMII *Diſſ. de Præſcriptione in Rebus Fidei adverſus novos Methodiſtas*, tom. iii. par. II. opp. p. 1079.

formity that reign in the tenets and worſhip of the church of *Rome*, he pretended to prove its divine original [k]. Such an argument muſt indeed ſurpriſe, coming from a man of learning, who could not be ignorant of the temporiſing ſpirit of the Roman pontifs, nor of the changes they had permitted in their diſcipline and doctrine, according to the genius of time and place, and the different characters of thoſe whom they were deſirous to gain over to their intereſts. It was ſtill more ſurpriſing in a French prelate, ſince the doctors of that nation generally maintain, that the leaden age does not differ more from the age of gold, than the modern church of *Rome* differs from the ancient and primitive church of that famous city.

---

[k] This is the purpoſe of BOSSUET's *Hiſtoire des Variations des Egliſes Proteſtantes*, which was publiſhed in 8vo at *Paris*, in the year 1688, and is ſtill conſidered by the Roman Catholics as one of the ſtrongeſt bulwarks of popery. Let them go on in their illuſions, and boaſt of this famous champion and defender; but if they have any true zeal for the cauſe he defends, or any regard for the authority of the ſupreme head of *their* church, they will bury in oblivion that maxim of this *their* champion, that *the church, which he frequently modifies, varies, and changes its doctrines, is deſtitute of the direction of the Holy Spirit.* ☞ This obſervatiom of Dr. MOSHEIM's might be verified by numberleſs inſtances of variations in the doctrine and worſhip of *Rome*, that muſt ſtrike every one who has any tolerable acquaintance with the hiſtory of that church. But, without going any farther than one ſingle inſtance, we may obſerve, that BOSSUET had a ſtriking proof of the variations of his own church, in the different reception that his *Expoſition of the Roman Catholic faith* met with from different perſons, and at different times. It was diſapproved of by one Pope, approved of by another; it was applauded by the Archbiſhop of *Rheims*, and condemned by the Univerſity of *Louvain*; it was cenſured by the Sorbonne in the year 1671, and declared by the ſame ſociety a true expoſition of the Catholic faith in the following century. For a full proof of the truth of theſe and other variations, ſee WAKE's *Expoſition*, &c.—LE CLERC, *Bibl. Univ.* tom. xi. p. 438, &c.—*General Dictionary*, at the article WAKE, in the note, and *Biblioth. des Sciences*, &c. tom. xviii. p. 29, &c.

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I.

Deſerters from the Proteſtant to the Romiſh Church.

XVI. Theſe various attempts of the votaries of *Rome*, though they gave abundant exerciſe to the activity and vigilance of the Proteſtant doctors, were not, however, attended with any important revolutions, or any conſiderable fruits. Some princes, indeed, and a few learned men, were thereby ſeduced into the communion of that church, from whoſe ſuperſtition and tyranny their anceſtors had delivered themſelves and others; but theſe defections were only perſonal, nor was there any people or province either inclined or engaged to follow theſe examples. Among the more illuſtrious deſerters of the Proteſtant religion, were CHRISTINA queen of *Sweden* [l], a princeſs of great ſpirit and genius, but precipitate and vehement in almoſt all her proceedings, and preferring her eaſe, pleaſure and liberty, to all other conſiderations [m]; WOLFANG WILLIAM, count *Palatine* of the *Rhine*; CHRISTIAN WILLIAM, marquis of *Brandenburg*; ERNEST, prince of *Heſſe* [n]; JOHN FREDERICK, duke of *Brunſwick*; and FREDERICK AUGUSTUS, king of *Poland*.

---

[l] See ARKENHOLT, *Memoires de la Reine* CHRISTINE, which contain a variety of agreeable and intereſting anecdotes.

☞ [m] The candid and impartial writer, mentioned in the preceding note, has given an ample account of the circumſtances that attended this queen's change of religion, and of the cauſes that might have contributed to determine her to a ſtep ſo unexpected and inexcuſable. It was neither the ſubtilty of DES CARTES, nor the dexterity of CANUT, that brought about this event, as BAILLET would perſuade us. The true ſtate of the caſe ſeems to have been this: CHRISTINA, having had her ſentiments of religion in general conſiderably perverted by the licentious inſinuations of her favourite BOURDELOT, was, by that means, prepared for embracing any particular religion that pleaſure, intereſt, or ambition, ſhould recommend to her. Upon this foundation, the Jeſuits MACEDO, MALINES, and CASSATI, under the immediate protection of PIMENTEL, and encouraged by the courts of *Rome*, *Spain*, and *Portugal*, employed their labours and dexterity in the converſion of this princeſs, whoſe paſſion for *Italy*, together with that taſte for the fine arts, and the precious remains of antiquity, that made her deſirous of ſojourning there, may have contributed not a little to make her embrace the religion of that country.

The learned men that embraced the communion of the church of *Rome* were, Baron BOINEBURG, ſecretary to the elector of *Mentz*, and an eminent patron of erudition and genius [o], CHRISTOPHER RANZOW, a knight of *Holſtein* [p], CASPER SCIOPPIUS, PETRUS BERTIUS, CHRISTOPHER BESOLD, ULRIC HUNNIUS, NICHOLAS STENON, a Daniſh phyſician, of great reputation in his profeſſion, JOHN PHILIP PFEIFFER, profeſſor at *Konigſburg*, LUCAS HOLSTENIUS, PETRUS LAMBECHIUS, HENRY BLUMIUS, profeſſor at *Helmſtadt*, a man of learning, and of exceſſive vanity [q], DANIEL NESSELIUS, ANDREW FROMMIUS;

---

[n] This learned and well-meaning prince was engaged, by the converſation and importunities of VALERIUS MAGNUS, a celebrated monk of the Capuchin Order, to embrace Popery, in the year 1651. See GRUBERI *Commercium Epiſtol. Leibnitianum*, tom. i. p. 27. 35. *Memoires de la Reine* CHRISTINE, tom. 1. p. 216.—It is, however, to be obſerved, that this prince, together with ANTHONY ULRIC, Duke of *Brunſwick*, and ſeveral others, who went over to the Church of *Rome*, did not go over to *that* Church of *Rome* which is now exhibited to us in the odious forms of ſuperſtition and tyranny, but to another kind of church, which, perhaps, never exiſted but in their idea, and which, at leaſt, has long ceaſed to exiſt. That this was the caſe appears evidently from the theological writings of Prince ERNEST.

[o] This eminent man, who had more learning than philoſophy, and who was more remarkable for the extent of his memory than for the rectitude of his judgment, followed the example of the Prince of *Heſſe*, in the year 1653. See GRUBERI *Commercium Epiſtol. Leibnitianum*, in which his Letters, and thoſe of CONRINGIUS are publiſhed, tom. i. p. 35, 37, 39. 48. 56. 60. 70, 76. 93, &c.

[p] See MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. i. p. 520.

[q] BLUMIUS deſerted from the Proteſtant Church in the year 1654.—See BURCKARDI *Hiſtoria Biblioth. Auguſtæ*, par. III. p. 223. 233.—GRUBERI *Commercium Epiſtol. Leibnitianum*, tom. i. p. 41. 95. 135. 137, 379. 388. 410. In theſe letters he is called *Florus*, probably in alluſion to his German name *Blum*, which ſignifies a *flower*.

BARTHOLD NIHUSIUS, CHRISTOPHER HELLWIGIUS, MATTHEW PRÆTORIUS, and a few others of inferior rank in the learned world. But theſe converſions, when conſidered with the motives that produced them, will be found, in *reality*, leſs honourable to the church of *Rome* than they are, *in appearance*; for if in the liſt of princes and learned men above mentioned, we efface thoſe whom the temptations of adverſity, the impulſe of avarice and ambition, the ſuggeſtions of levity, the effects of perſonal attachments, the power of ſuperſtition upon a feeble and irreſolute mind, and other motives of like merit, engaged to embrace the Romiſh religion, theſe proſelytes will be reduced to a number too ſmall to excite the envy of the Proteſtant churches [r].

The Romiſh church-intereſt loſes ground in the Eaſt.

XVII. The Chriſtian churches in the Eaſt, which were independent on the yoke of *Rome*, did not ſtand leſs firm and ſtedfaſt againſt the attempts of the papal miſſionaries than thoſe of *Europe*. The pompous accounts which ſeveral Roman-catholic writers have given of the wonderful ſucceſs of theſe miſſionaries among the *Neſtorians* and *Monophyſites*, are little elſe than ſplendid fables, deſigned to amuſe and dazzle the multitude; and many of the wiſeſt and beſt of the Roman-catholic doctors acknowledge, that they ought to be conſidered in no other light. As little credit is to be given to thoſe who mention the ſtrong propenſity diſcovered by ſeveral of the heads and ſuperintendants of the Chriſtian ſects in theſe remote regions, to ſubmit to the juriſdiction of the Roman pontif [s]. It is evident, on the contrary, that *Rome*, in two remarkable inſtances, ſuffered a conſiderable diminution of its influence and authority in the eaſtern world during this century. One of theſe inſtances was the dreadful revolution in *Japan*, which has been already related, and which was unhappily followed by the total extinction of Chriſtianity in that great monarchy. The other was the downfal of Popery by the extirpation of its miſſionaries in the empire of *Abyſſinia*, of which it will not be improper, or foreign from our purpoſe, to give here a brief account.

---

[r] See for a particular account of theſe proſelytes to Popery, WEISMAN'S *Hiſtoria Eccleſ.* Sæc. xvii. p. 738.—WALIKIUS'S *Introductio in Controverſias*, tom. ii. p. 728.—ARNOLD'S *Kirchen und Ketzer Hiſtorie*, par. p. 912. and other writers of civil and literary hiſtory.

[s] See the remarks made by CHARDIN in ſeveral places of the laſt edition of his travels. See alſo what URBAN CERRI, in his

About the commencement of the ſeventeenth century, the Portugueſe Jeſuits renewed, under the moſt auſpicious encouragement, the miſſion to *Abyſſinia* that had been, for ſome time before that period, interrupted and ſuſpended. For the Emperor SUSNEIUS, who aſſumed the denomination of SELTAM SEGUED, after the defeat of his enemies and his acceſſion to the crown, covered the miſſionaries with his peculiar protection. Gained over to their cauſe, partly by the eloquence of the Jeſuits, and partly by the hopes of maintaining himſelf upon the throne by the ſuccours of the Portugueſe, he committed the whole government of the church to ALPHONSO MENDEZ, a miſſionary from that nation; created him patriarch of the Abyſſinians; and not only ſwore, in a public manner, allegiance to the Roman pontif in the year 1626, but moreover obliged his ſubjects to abandon the religious rites and tenets of their anceſtors, and to embrace the doctrine

---

his *Preſent State of the Church of Rome*, ſays of the *Armenians* and *Coptes*.—It is true indeed, that among theſe ſects the Papal miſſionaries ſometimes form congregations that are obedient to the ſee of *Rome*; but theſe congregations are poor and inconſiderable, and compoſed only of a handful of members. Thus the Capuchins, about the middle of the century now under conſideration, founded a ſmall congregation among the Monophyſites of *Aſia*, whoſe biſhop reſides at *Aleppo*. See LEQUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. ii. p. 1408.

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I.

and worſhip of the Romiſh church. But the new *patriarch* ruined, by his intemperate zeal, imprudence, and arrogance, the cauſe in which he had embarked, and occaſioned the total ſubverſion of the Roman pontif's authority and juriſdiction, which had really been eſtabliſhed upon ſolid foundations. For he began his miniſtry with the moſt inconſiderate acts of violence and deſpotiſm. Following the ſpirit of the Spaniſh *inquiſition*, he employed formidable threatnings and cruel tortures to convert the Abyſſinians; the greateſt part of whom, together with their prieſts and miniſters, held the religion of their anceſtors in the higheſt veneration, and were willing to part with their lives and fortunes rather than forſake it. He alſo ordered thoſe to be rebaptized, who, in compliance with the orders of the emperor, had embraced the faith of *Rome*, as if their former religion had been nothing more than a ſyſtem of Paganiſm [*t*]. This the Abyſſinian clergy looked upon as a ſhocking inſult upon the religious diſcipline of their anceſtors, as even more provoking than the violence and barbarities practiſed againſt thoſe who refuſed to ſubmit to the papal yoke. Nor did the inſolent patriarch reſt ſatisfied with theſe arbitrary and deſpotic proceedings

---

☞ [*t*] The reader will recollect, that the *Abyſſinians* differ but very little from the *Copts* in *Egypt*, and acknowledge the patriarch of ALEXANDRIA as their ſpiritual chief. They receive the Old and New Teſtament, the three firſt Councils, the Nicene Creed, and the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions. Their firſt converſion to Chriſtianity is attributed by ſome to the famous prime miniſter of their Queen CANDACE, mentioned in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*; it is however probable, that the general converſion of that great empire was not perfected before the fourth century, when FRUMENTIUS, ordained Biſhop of *Axuma* by ATHANASIUS, exerciſed his miniſtry among them with the moſt aſtoniſhing ſucceſs. They were eſteemed a pure church before they fell into the errors of EUTYCHES and DIOSCORUS; and even ſince that period they are ſtill a purer church than that of *Rome*.

in the church; he excited tumults and factions in the ſtate, and, with an unparalleled ſpirit of rebellion and arrogance, encroached upon the prerogatives of the throne, and attempted to give law to the emperor himſelf. Hence aroſe civil commotions, conſpiracies, and ſeditions, which excited in a little time the indignation of the emperor, and the hatred of the people againſt the Jeſuits, and produced at length, in the year 1631, a public *declaration* from the throne, by which the Abyſſinian monarch annulled the orders he had formerly given in favour of popery, and left his ſubjects at liberty, either to perſevere in the doctrine of their anceſtors, or to embrace the faith of *Rome*. This rational declaration was mild and indulgent towards the Jeſuits, conſidering the treatment their inſolence and preſumption had ſo juſtly deſerved; but in the following reign much ſeverer meaſures were employed againſt them. BASILIDES, the ſon of SEGUED, who ſucceeded his father in the year 1632, no ſooner aſcended the throne, than he thought it expedient to rid his dominions of theſe troubleſome and deſpotic gueſts; and accordingly, in the year 1634, he baniſhed from the territories of *Ethiopia* the Patriarch MENDEZ, with all the Jeſuits and Europeans that belonged to his retinue, and treated the Roman-catholic miſſionaries with exceſſive rigour and ſeverity [*u*]. From this period

---

[*u*] See LUDOLFI *Hiſtor. Æthiopica*, lib. iii. cap. xii.—GEDDES's *Church Hiſtory of Ethiopia*, p. 233.—LA CROZE, *Hiſtoire du Chriſtianiſme de l' Ethiopie*, p. 79.—LOBO, *Voyage d' Abyſſinie*, p. 116. 130. 144. with the additions of LE GRAND, p. 173. and the fourth *Diſſertation* that is ſubjoined to the ſecond volume. In this diſſertation LE GRAND, himſelf a Roman Catholic, makes the following remark upon the conduct of the Patriarch MENDEZ: "It were to be wiſhed, *ſays he*, "that the patriarch had never intermeddled in ſuch a variety "of affairs," *(by which mitigated expreſſion the author means his*

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I.

riod the very name of *Rome*, its religion, and its pontif, were objects of the higheſt averſion among the Abyſſinians, who guarded their frontiers with the greateſt vigilance and the ſtricteſt attention, leſt any Jeſuit or Romiſh miſſionary ſhould ſteal into their territories in diſguiſe, and excite new tumults and commotions in the kingdom. The Roman pontifs indeed made more than one attempt to recover the authority they had loſt by the ill ſucceſs and miſconduct of the Jeſuits. They began by ſending two Capuchin monks to repair their loſs; but theſe unfortunate wretches were no ſooner diſcovered than they were ſtoned to death. They afterwards employed more artful and clandeſtine methods of reviving the miſſions, and had recourſe to the influence and interceſſion of LEWIS XIV., king of *France*, to procure admiſſion for their emiſſaries into the Abyſſinian empire [w]; but, as far as we have learnt, theſe

---

his ambitious attempts to govern in the cabinet as well as in the church), "nor carried his authority to ſuch a height, as to behave in *Ethiopia* as if he had been in a country where the *inquiſition* was eſtabliſhed: for, by this conduct, he ſet all the people againſt him, and excited in them ſuch an averſion to the Roman Catholics in general, and to the Jeſuits in particular, as nothing has been hitherto able to diminiſh, and which ſubſiſts in its full force to this day." ☞ The third book of LA CROZE's Hiſtory, which relates to the progreſs and ruin of this miſſion, is tranſlated by Mr. LOCKMAN into Engliſh, and inſerted in *The Travels of the Jeſuits*, vol. i. p. 308, &c. as alſo is PONCET's Voyage, mentioned in the following note.

[w] Theſe projects are mentioned by CERRI, in his *Etat preſent de l' Egliſe Romaine*, p. 217.—LE GRAND, in his *Supplement* to LOBO's *Itinerarium Æthiopicum*, tom. i. p. 181 *.—

☞ * Father LOBO, who reſided nine years in *Ethiopia*, has given an elegant and lively, though ſimple and ſuccinct deſcription, of that vaſt empire, in his *Itinerarium Æthiopicum*. This itinerary was tranſlated into French by M. LE GRAND, and enriched by him with ſeveral curious anecdotes and diſſertations. Hence Dr. MOSHEIM ſometimes quotes the *Itinerarium* under the title of *Voyage d' Abiſſinie*, referring to LE GRAND's French tranſlation of it.

theſe attempts have hitherto proved unſucceſsful, nor have the pontifs or their votaries been as yet able to calm the reſentment of that exaſperated nation, or to conquer its reluctance againſt the worſhip and juriſdiction of the church of *Rome* [x].

XVIII. Hitherto

The reader who would know what credit is to be given to what the Jeſuits ſay of the attachment and veneration which the Aſiatic and African Chriſtians expreſs for the Church of *Rome*, will do well to compare the relations of Le Grand, who was a Roman Catholic, and no enemy to the Jeſuits, and who drew his relations from the moſt authentic records, with thoſe of Poncet, a French phyſician, who went into *Ethiopia* in the year 1698, accompanied by Father Bredevent, a Jeſuit, who died during the voyage. This compariſon will convince every ingenuous and impartial inquirer, that the accounts of the Jeſuits are not to be truſted to, and that they ſurpaſs ancient Carthage itſelf in the art of deceiving. Poncet's Voyage is publiſhed in the fourth volume of the Jeſuitical work, entitled, *Lettres Curieuſes et Edifiantes des Miſſions Etrangeres.*

[x] Lafitau and Reboulet, who have compoſed each a Life of Pope Clement XI., tell us, that the Emperor of *Abyſſinia* deſired the Roman pontif, in the year 1703, to ſend to his court miſſionaries and legates to inſtruct him and his people, and to receive their ſubmiſſion to the ſee of *Rome*. Theſe biographers go ſtill further, and aſſert, that this monarch actually embraced the communion of *Rome* in the year 1712. But theſe aſſertions are idle fictions, forged by the Jeſuits and their creatures. It is well known, on the contrary, that, ſo lately as a very few years ago, the edict prohibiting all Europeans to enter into *Ethiopia* was ſtill in force, and was executed with the greateſt ſeverity. Even the Turks are included in this prohibition; and, what is ſtill more remarkable, the Egyptian Monophyſites, who have once entered within the Abyſſinian territories, are not allowed to return into their own country. All theſe facts are confirmed by a modern writer of the moſt unqueſtionable authority, the learned and worthy M. Maillet, the French conſul-general in *Egypt*, and ambaſſador from Lewis XIV. to the Emperor of *Abyſſinia*, in his *Deſcription de l'Egypte*, par. I. p. 325: which was publiſhed at *Paris* in 4to in the year 1735. See alſo Le Grand's Supplement to Lobo's *Itinerarium*, which was publiſhed in the year 1728. This laſt mentioned author, after relating all the attempts that have been made in our times, by the French nation and the Roman pontifs, to introduce Romiſh prieſts into *Abyſſinia*, adds, that all ſuch attempts muſt appear vain and chimerical to all thoſe

who

The papal authority loſes ground.

XVIII. Hitherto we have confined our views to the external ſtate and condition of the church of *Rome*, and to the good or ill ſucceſs that attended its endeavours to extend its dominion in the different parts of the world. It will be now proper to change the ſcene, to conſider this church in its internal conſtitution, and to paſs in review its polity, diſcipline, inſtitutions, and doctrine. Its ancient form of government ſtill remained; but its pontifs and biſhops loſt, in many places, no ſmall part of that extenſive authority they had ſo long enjoyed. The halcyon days were now over, in which the papal clergy excited with impunity ſeditious tumults in the ſtate, intermeddled openly in the tranſactions of government, ſtruck terror into the hearts of ſovereigns and ſubjects by the thunder of their anathemas, and, impoſing burthenſome contributions on the credulous multitude, filled their coffers by notorious acts of tyranny and oppreſſion. The pope himſelf, though ſtill honoured with the ſame pompous titles and denominations, found nevertheleſs frequently, by a mortifying and painful experience, that theſe titles had loſt a conſiderable part of their former ſignification, and that the energy of theſe denominations diminiſhed from day to day. For now almoſt all the princes and ſtates of *Europe* had adopted that important maxim that had been formerly peculiar to the French nation: *That the power of the Roman pontif is entirely confined to matters of a religious and ſpiritual nature, and cannot, under any pretext whatſoever, extend to civil tranſactions or worldly affairs.* In

---

who have any knowledge of the empire of *Abyſſinia*, and of the ſpirit and character of its inhabitants; his words are: *Toutes ces enterpriſes paroitront chimeriques à ceux qui connoitront l'Abiſſinie et les Abiſſins.* It is highly probable, that the new miſſion which is preparing at *Rome* for the empire of *Abyſſinia*, will prove a new inſtance of the ſolidity of M. LE GRAND's reflexion.

the ſchools, indeed, and colleges of Roman-catholic countries, and in the writings of the Romiſh prieſts and doctors, the majeſty of the pope was ſtill exalted in the moſt emphatic terms, and his prerogatives diſplayed with all imaginable pomp. The Jeſuits alſo, who have been always ambitious of a diſtinguiſhed place among the aſſertors of the power and pre-eminence of the Roman ſee, and who give themſelves out for the pope's moſt obſequious creatures, raiſed their voices, in this ignoble cauſe, even above thoſe of the ſchools and colleges. Nay, even in the courts of ſovereign princes, very flattering terms and high-ſounding phraſes were ſometimes uſed, to expreſs the dignity and authority of the head of the church. But as it happens in other caſes, that men's actions are frequently very different from their language, ſo was this obſervation particularly verified in the caſe of *Rome's Holy Father*. He was extolled in words, by thoſe who deſpiſed him moſt in reality; and when any diſpute aroſe between him and the princes of his communion, the latter reſpected his authority no further than they found expedient for their own purpoſes, and meaſured the extent of his prerogatives and juriſdiction, not by the ſlaviſh adulation of the colleges and the Jeſuits, but by a regard to their own intereſts and independence.

The rupture between Paul V. and the Venetians.

XIX. This the Roman pontifs learned, by a diſagreeable experience, as often as they endeavoured, during this century, to reſume their former pretenſions, to interpoſe their authority in civil affairs, and encroach upon the juriſdiction of ſovereign ſtates. The conduct of Paul V., and the conſequences that followed it, furniſh a ſtriking example that abundantly verifies this obſervation. This haughty and arrogant pontif laid the Republic of *Venice* under an *Interdict* in the year 1606. The reaſons alleged for this inſolent proceeding, were the proſecution of two eccleſiaſtics for capital crimes; as alſo two wiſe edicts, one of which prohibited the erection of any more religious edifices in the Venetian territories, without the knowledge and conſent of the ſenate; and the other the alienation of any lay poſſeſſions or eſtates in favour of the clergy, without the expreſs approbation of the Republic. The Venetian ſenate received this papal inſult with dignity, and conducted themſelves under it with becoming reſolution and fortitude. Their firſt ſtep was to prevent their clergy from executing the *Interdict*, by an act prohibiting that ceſſation of public worſhip, and that ſuſpenſion of the ſacraments, which the pope had commanded in this imperious mandate. Their next ſtep was equally vigorous; for they baniſhed from their territories the Jeſuits and Capuchin friars, who obeyed the orders of the pope, in oppoſition to their expreſs commands. In the proceſs of this controverſy they employed their ableſt pens, and particularly that of the learned and ingenious PAUL SARPI, of the Order of *Servites*, to demonſtrate, on the one hand, the juſtice of their cauſe, and to determine, on the other, after an accurate and impartial enquiry, the true limits of the Roman pontif's juriſdiction and authority. The arguments of theſe writers were ſo ſtrong and urgent, that BARONIUS, and the other learned advocates whom the pope had employed in ſupporting his pretenſions and defending his meaſures, ſtruggled in vain againſt their irreſiſtible evidence. In the mean time all things tended towards a rupture, and PAUL V. was gathering together his forces in order to make war upon the Venetians, when HENRY IV., king of *France*, interpoſed as mediator [y], and concluded a peace between

---

☞ [y] It muſt be obſerved here, that it was at the requeſt of the pope, and not of the Venetians, that HENRY IV. interpoſed as mediator. The Venetians had nothing to fear.

Their

tween the contending parties, on conditions not very honourable to the ambitious pontif [z]. For the Venetians could not be perſuaded to repeal the edicts and reſolutions they had iſſued out againſt the court of *Rome* upon this occaſion, nor to recal the Jeſuits from their exile [a].—It is remarkable,

---

Their cauſe was conſidered as the common cauſe of all the ſovereign ſtates of *Italy*; and the dukes of *Urbino*, *Modena*, and *Savoy*, had already offered their troops and ſervices to the Republic. But the raſh pontif, perceiving the ſtorm that was gathering againſt him, took refuge in the French monarch's interceſſion.

[z] Beſides De Thou and other hiſtorians, ſee Daniel, *Hiſtoire de le France*, tom. x. p. 385.—Heidegger's *Hiſtoria Papatûs*, *Period.* vii. § ccxx. p. 322.—Jo. Wolfg. Jaegeri *Hiſtoria Eccleſ.* Sæc. xvii. Decenn. i. p. 108.—More eſpecially the writings of the famous Paul Sarpi, commonly called Fra-Paolo, and of the other divines and canoniſts that defended the cauſe of the Republic, deſerve a careful and attentive peruſal. For theſe writings were compoſed with ſuch ſolidity, learning, and eloquence, that they produced remarkable effects, and contributed much to open the eyes of ſeveral princes and magiſtrates; and to prevent their ſubmitting blindly and implicitly, as their anceſtors had done, to the imperious dictates of the Roman pontifs. Among the moſt maſterly pieces written in this cauſe, we muſt place Fra-Paolo's *Iſtoria delle coſe paſſate entre* Paul V., *et la Republ. di Venetia*, publiſhed in 4to at *Mirandola*, in the year 1624; and his *Hiſtoria Interdicti Veneti*, which was publiſhed in 4to at *Cambridge*, in the year 1626, by biſhop Bedell, who, during theſe troubles, had been chaplain to the Engliſh ambaſſador at *Venice*. Paul V., by forcing the Venetians to publiſh to the world, in theſe admirable productions, his arrogance and temerity on the one hand, and many truths unfavourable to the pretenſions of the popes on the other, was the occaſion of the greateſt perplexities and oppoſitions that the court of *Rome* had to encounter in after-times.

[a] When the peace was made between the Venetians and the pope, in the year 1607, the Capuchins and the other eccleſiaſtics, that had been baniſhed on account of their partiality to the cauſe of *Rome*, were all re-inſtated in their reſpective functions, except the Jeſuits. Theſe latter, however, were recalled in the year 1657, under the pontificate of Alexander VII., in conſequence of the earneſt and importunate requeſts of Lewis XIV., king of *France*, and ſeveral other princes,

remarkable, that, at the time of this rupture, the ſenate of *Venice* entertained ſerious thoughts of a total ſeparation from the church of *Rome*, in which the ambaſſadors of *England* and *Holland* did all that was in their power to confirm them. But many conſiderations of a momentous nature intervened to prevent the execution of this deſign, which, as it would ſeem, had not the approbation of the ſagacious and prudent FRA-PAOLO, notwithſtanding his averſion to the tyranny and maxims of the court of *Rome* [*b*].

---

princes, who gave the Venetians no reſt until they re-admitted theſe dangerous gueſts into their territories. It is, nevertheleſs, to be obſerved, that the Jeſuits never recovered the credit and influence they had formerly enjoyed in that Republic, nor, at this preſent time, is there any people of the Romiſh communion, among whom their ſociety has leſs power than among the Venetians, who have never yet forgot their rebellious behaviour during the quarrel now mentioned. See the *Voyage Hiſtorique en Italie, Allemagne, Suiſſe* (publiſhed at *Amſterdam* in 8vo in the year 1736), tom. i. p. 291. It is further worthy of obſervation, that, ſince this famous quarrel between the Republic of *Venice* and the court of *Rome*, the *bulls* and reſcripts of the popes have juſt as much authority in that Republic, as its ſenate judges conſiſtent with the rules of wiſe policy, and the true intereſts and welfare of the community. For proof of this, we need go no further than the reſpectable teſtimony of Cardinal HENRY NORIS, who, in the year 1676, wrote to MAGLIABECCHI in the following terms: *Poche Bulle paſſevano quelle acque verſo, la parte del Adriatico, per le maſſime laſciate nel Teſtamento di* FRA-PAOLO: i. e. *Few papal Bulls paſs the Po, or approach the coaſts of the Adriatic ſea; the maxims bequeathed to the Venetians by* FRA-PAOLO *render this paſſage extremely difficult.*

[*b*] This deſign of the Venetians is particularly mentioned by BURNET, in his *Life of Biſhop* BEDEL, and by LA COURAYER, in his *Defenſe de la Nouvelle Traduction de l'Hiſtoire du Concile de Trente* (publiſhed in 8vo at *Amſterdam* in the year 1742) p. 35. This latter writer ſhews plainly, that FRA-PAOLO, though his ſentiments differed in many points from the doctrine of the church of *Rome*, yet did not approve of all the tenets received by the Proteſtants, nor ſuggeſt to the Venetians the deſign of renouncing the Romiſh faith.

The conteſt between the Roman pontifs and the court of *Portugal.*

XX. Had the Portugueſe acted with the ſame wiſdom and reſolution that diſtinguiſhed the Venetians, their conteſt with the court of *Rome*, which begun under the pontificate of URBAN VIII., in the year 1641, and was carried on until the year 1666, would have been terminated in a manner equally diſadvantageous to the haughty pretenſions of the Roman pontifs. The Portugueſe, unable to bear any longer the tyranny and oppreſſion of the Spaniſh government, threw off the yoke, and choſe Don JOHN duke of *Braganza*, for their king. URBAN VIII., and his ſucceſſors in the ſee of *Rome*, obſtinately refuſed, notwithſtanding the moſt earneſt and preſſing ſolicitations both of the French and Portugueſe, either to acknowledge Don JOHN's title to the crown, or to confirm the biſhops whom this prince had named to fill the vacant ſees in *Portugal.* Hence it happened, that the greateſt part of the kingdom remained for a long time without biſhops. The pretended vicar of Chriſt upon earth, whoſe character ought to ſet him above the fear of man, was ſo ſlaviſhly apprehenſive of the reſentment of the king of *Spain*, that, rather than offend that monarch, he violated the moſt ſolemn obligations of his ſtation, by leaving ſuch a number of churches without paſtors and ſpiritual guides. The French, and other European courts, adviſed and exhorted the new king of *Portugal* to follow the noble example of the Venetians, and to aſſemble a national council, by which the new created biſhops might be confirmed, in ſpite of the pope, in their reſpective ſees. Don JOHN ſeemed diſpoſed to liſten to their councils, and to act with reſolution and vigour at this important criſis; but his enterpriſing ſpirit was checked by the formidable power of the *inquiſition*, the incredible ſuperſtition of the people, and the blind zeal and attachment that the nation, in general, diſcovered for the perſon and authority of the Roman pontif. Hence the popes continued their inſults with impunity; and it was not before the peace concluded between *Portugal* and *Spain*, five-and-twenty years after this revolution, that the biſhops nominated by the king were confirmed by the pope. It was under the pontificate of CLEMENT IX. that an accommodation was brought about between the courts of *Portugal* and *Rome*. It muſt, indeed, be obſerved, to the honour of the Portugueſe, that, notwithſtanding their ſuperſtitious attachment to the court of *Rome*, they vigorouſly oppoſed its ambitious pontif in all his attempts to draw from this conteſt an augmentation of his power and authority in that kingdom; nor did the biſhops permit, in their reſpective ſees, any encroachment to be made, at this time, upon the privileges and rights enjoyed by their monarchs in former ages [c].

The conteſts between the French nation and the Roman pontifs.

XXI. There had ſubſiſted, during many preceding ages, an almoſt uninterrupted miſintelligence between the French monarchs and the Roman pontifs, which had often occaſioned an open rupture, and which produced more than once that violent effect during this century. The greateſt exertions of induſtry, artifice, and aſſiduous labour were employed by the popes, during the whole of this period, to conquer the averſion that the French had conceived againſt the pretenſions and authority of the court of *Rome*, and to undermine imperceptibly, and enervate and deſtroy by degrees, the *liberties of the*

---

[c] See GEDDES's *Hiſtory of the Pope's behaviour towards Portugal*, from 1641 to 1666, in his *Miſcellaneous Tracts*, tom. ii. p. 73—186.—The cauſe of the Portugueſe, in this quarrel, is defended with great learning and ſagacity by a French writer, whoſe name was BULLIAD, in a book entitled, *Pro Eccleſiis Luſitanis ad Clerum Gallicanum Libelli Duo*.

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I.

Gallican church. In this arduous and important enterpriſe the Jeſuits acted a principal part, and ſeconded, with all their dexterity and craft, the deſigns of the aſpiring pontifs. But theſe attempts and ſtratagems were effectually defeated and diſconcerted by the parliament of *Paris*; while many able pens expoſed the tyranny and injuſtice of the papal claims, RICHER, LAUNOY, PETRUS DE MARCA, NATALIS ALEXANDER, ELLIS DU PIN, and others, diſplayed their learning and talents in this conteſt, though with different degrees of merit. They appealed to the ancient decrees of the Gallican church, which they confirmed by recent authorities, and enforced by new and victorious arguments. It will naturally be thought, that theſe bold and reſpectable defenders of the rights and liberties both of church and ſtate were amply rewarded, for their generous labours, by peculiar marks of the approbation and protection of the court of *France*. But this was ſo far from being always the caſe, that they received, on the contrary, from time to time, ſeveral marks of its reſentment and diſpleaſure, deſigned to appeaſe the rage and indignation of the threatening pontif, whom it was thought expedient to treat ſometimes with artifice and caution. *Rome*, however, gained but little by this mild policy of the French court. For it has been always a prevailing maxim with the monarchs of that nation, that their prerogatives and pretenſions are to be defended againſt the encroachments of the Roman pontifs with as little noiſe and contention as poſſible; and that pompous memorials, and warm and vehement remonſtrances, are to be carefully avoided, except in caſes of urgent neceſſity [d]. Nor do theſe

---

☞ [d] It is with a view to this, that VOLTAIRE, ſpeaking of the manner in which the court of *France* maintains its prerogatives againſt the Roman pontif, ſays, pleaſantly, that *the King of France kiſſes the Pope's feet, and ties up his hands.*

princes think it beneath their dignity to yield, more or leſs, to time and occaſion, and even to pretend a mighty veneration for the orders and authority of the pontifs, in order to obtain from them, by fair means, the immunities and privileges which they look upon as their due. But they are, nevertheleſs, conſtantly on their guard; and, as ſoon as they perceive the court of *Rome* taking advantage of their lenity to extend its dominion, and the lordly popes growing inſolent in conſequence of their mildneſs and ſubmiſſion, they then alter their tone, change their meaſures, and reſume the language that becomes the monarchs of a nation, that could never bear the tyranny and oppreſſion of the papal yoke. All this appears evidently in the conteſts that aroſe between the courts of *France* and *Rome*, under the reign LEWIS XIV., of which it will not be improper to give here ſome intereſting inſtances [e].

And more eſpecially thoſe of Lewis XIV.

XXII. The firſt of theſe conteſts happened under the pontificate of ALEXANDER VII., and was owing to the temerity and inſolence of his Corſican guards, who, in the year 1662, inſulted the French ambaſſador and his lady, the duke and dutcheſs of CREQUI, at the inſtigation, as it is ſuppoſed, of the pope's nephews. LEWIS demanded ſatisfaction for this inſult offered to his repreſentative; and, on the pope's delaying to anſwer this demand, actually ordered his troops to file off for *Italy*, and to beſiege the arrogant pontif in his capital. The latter, terrified by

---

☞ [e] The large note [l] of the original, in which Dr. MOSHEIM has examined that intereſting queſtion, *viz. Whether or no the papal authority gained or loſt ground in* France *during the ſeventeenth century*, is tranſpoſed by the tranſlator into the text, and placed at the end of our author's account of LEWIS XIV.'s quarrels with the pope, where it comes in with the utmoſt propriety. See § xxiii.

theſe warlike preparations, implored the clemency of the incenſed monarch, who granted his pardon and abſolution to the humble pontif, and concluded a peace with him at *Piſa*, in the year 1664, upon the moſt inglorious and mortifying conditions. Theſe conditions were, that the pope ſhould ſend his nephew to *Paris*, in the character of a ſuppliant for pardon; that he ſhould brand the Corſican guards with perpetual infamy, and break them by a public edict; and ſhould erect a pyramid at *Rome*, with an inſcription deſtined to preſerve the memory of this audacious inſtance of papal inſolence, and of the exemplary manner in which it was chaſtiſed and humbled by the French monarch. It is however to be obſerved, that in this conteſt LEWIS did not chaſtiſe ALEXANDER, conſidered in his ghoſtly character as head of the church; but as a temporal prince, violating the law of nations [*f*]. He however ſhewed, on other occaſions, that, when properly provoked, he was as much diſpoſed to humble *papal* as *princely* ambition, and that he feared the *head of the church* as little as the *temporal ruler* of the eccleſiaſtical ſtate. This appeared evidently by the important and warm debate he had with INNOCENT XI., conſidered in his *ſpiritual* character, which began about the year 1678, and was carried on with great animoſity and contention for ſeveral years after. The ſubject of this controverſy was a *right*, called in *France the regale*, by which the French king, upon the death of a biſhop, laid claim to the revenues and fruits of his ſee, and diſcharged alſo ſeveral parts [*g*] of the epiſcopal

---

[*f*] See JAEGERI *Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* Sæc. xvi. Decenn. vii. lib. ii. cap. ii. p. 180.—VOLTAIRE, *Siécle de* LOUIS XIV. tom. I. p. 134. *Edit. de Dreſde* 1753.—ARCKENHOLTZ, *Memoires de la Reine* CHRISTINE, tom. ii. p. 72.

☞ [*g*] The author means here undoubtedly the collation of all benefices, which became vacant in the dioceſe of a deceaſed epiſcopal function, until a new biſhop was elected. LEWIS was deſirous that all the churches in his dominions ſhould be ſubject to the *regale*. INNOCENT pretended, on the contrary, that this claim could not be granted with ſuch univerſality; nor would he conſent to any augmentation of the prerogatives of this nature, that had formerly been enjoyed by the kings of *France*. Thus the claims of the prince, and the remonſtrances of the pontif, both urged with warmth and perſeverance, formed a ſharp and violent conteſt, which was carried on, on both ſides, with ſpirit and reſolution. The pontif ſent forth his bulls and mandates. The monarch oppoſed their execution by the terror of penal laws, and the authority of ſevere edicts againſt all who dared to treat them with the ſmalleſt regard. When the pontif refuſed to confirm the biſhops that were nominated by the monarch, the latter took care to have them conſecrated and inducted into their reſpective ſees; and thus, in ſome meaſure, declared to the world, that the Gallican church could govern itſelf without the intervention of the Roman pontif. INNOCENT XI., who was a man of a high ſpirit, and inflexibly obſtinate in his purpoſes, did not loſe courage at a view of theſe reſolute and vigorous proceedings; but threatened the monarch with the divine vengeance, iſſued out bull after bull, and did every thing in his power to convince his adverſaries, that the vigour and intrepidity, which formerly diſtinguiſhed the lordly rulers of the Romiſh church, were not yet totally extinguiſhed [h].

This

---

ceaſed biſhop before the nomination of his ſucceſſor. This right of collation, in ſuch caſes, was comprehended in the *Regale*. See note [i].

[h] See JO. HEN. HEIDEGGERI *Hiſtoria Papatûs*, Period. vii. § cccxli. p. 555.—VOLTAIRE *Siécle de* LOUIS XIV. tom. i. p. 221. *Edit. de Dreſde* 1753. A great number of writers have either

This obſtinacy, however, only ſerved to add fuel to the indignation and reſentment of LEWIS. And accordingly, that monarch ſummoned the famous aſſembly of biſhops [*i*], which met at *Paris*, in the year 1682. In this convocation, the ancient doctrine of the Gallican church, that declares the power of the pope to be *merely* ſpiritual, and alſo inferior to that of a general council, was drawn up anew in four propoſitions [*j*], which were ſolemnly adopted by the whole aſ-

---

either incidentally or profeſſedly treated the ſubject of the *Regale*, and have given ample accounts of the controverſies it has occaſioned. But none has traced out more circumſtantially the riſe and progreſs of this famous right than Cardinal HENRY NORIS, in his *Iſtoria delle Inveſtiture Eccleſiaſt.* p. 547, which is inſerted in the fourth volume of his works.

☞ [*i*] This aſſembly, which conſiſted of thirty-five biſhops, and as many deputies of the ſecond Order, extended the *Regale* to all the churches in *France* without exception. The biſhops, at the ſame time, thought proper to repreſent it to the king as their humble opinion, that thoſe eccleſiaſtics whom he ſhould be pleaſed to nominate, during the vacancy of the ſee, to benefices attended with cure of ſouls, were obliged to apply for induction and confirmation to the grand vicars appointed by the chapters.

☞ [*j*] Theſe four propoſitions were to the following purpoſe:

1. That neither St. PETER nor his ſucceſſors have received from God any power to interfere, directly or indirectly, in what concerns the temporal intereſts of princes and ſovereign ſtates; that kings and princes cannot be depoſed by eccleſiaſtical authority, nor their ſubjects freed from the ſacred obligation of fidelity and allegiance, by the power of the church, or the bulls of the Roman pontif.

2. That the decrees of the council of *Conſtance*, which maintained the authority of general councils as ſuperior to that of the pope's, in ſpiritual matters, are approved and adopted by the Gallican church.

3. That the rules, cuſtoms, inſtitutions, and obſervances, which have been received in the Gallican church, are to be preſerved inviolable.

4. That the deciſions of the pope, in points of faith, are not infallible, unleſs they be attended with the conſent of the church.

ſembly, and were propoſed to the whole body of the clergy and to all the univerſities throughout the kingdom, as a ſacred and inviolable rule of faith. But even this reſpectable deciſion of the matter, which gave ſuch a mortal wound to the authority of *Rome*, did not ſhake the conſtancy of its reſolute pontif, or reduce him to ſilence [k].

Another conteſt aroſe, ſome time after the one now mentioned, between theſe two princes, whoſe mutual jealouſy and diſlike of each other contributed much to inflame their diviſions. This new diſpute broke out in the year 1687, when Innocent XI. wiſely reſolved to ſuppreſs the franchiſes and the *right of aſylum* that had formerly been enjoyed by the ambaſſadors reſiding at

---

[k] This pope was far from keeping ſilence with reſpect to the famous propoſitions mentioned in the preceding note. As they were highly unfavourable to his authority, ſo he took care to have them refuted and oppoſed both in private and in public. The principal champion for the papal cauſe, on this occaſion, was Cardinal Celestin Sfondrati, who, in the year 1684, publiſhed, under the feigned name of Eugenius Lombardus, a treatiſe entitled, *Regale Sacerdotium Romano Pontifici aſſertum, et quatuor propoſitionibus explicatum.* This treatiſe was printed in *Switzerland*, as appears evidently by the characters or form of the letters. A multitude of Italian, German, and Spaniſh doctors ſtood forth to ſupport the tottering majeſty of the pontif againſt the court of *France;* and more eſpecially the learned Nicolas du Bois, profeſſor at *Louvain*, whoſe writings in defence of the pope are mentioned by Bossuet. But all theſe papal champions were defeated by the famous prelate laſt mentioned, the learned and eloquent biſhop of *Meaux*, who, by the king's ſpecial order, compoſed that celebrated work, which appeared after his death, in two volumes 4to, and in the year 1730, under the following title: *Defenſio Declarationis celeberrimæ, quam de Poteſtate Eccleſiaſtica ſanxit Clerus Gallicanus;* xix *Martii*, MDCLXXXII, *Luxemburgi.* The late publication of this work was owing to the proſpect of a reconciliation between the courts of *France* and *Rome*, after the death of Innocent XI., which reconciliation actually took place, and engaged Lewis XIV. to prevent this work being put to the preſs.

Rome [*l*], and had, on many occaſions, proved a ſanctuary for rapine, violence, and injuſtice, by procuring impunity for the moſt heinous malefactors. The Marquis DE LAVARDIN refuſed, in the name of the French king, to ſubmit to this new regulation; and LEWIS took all the violent methods that pride and reſentment could invent, to oblige the pontif to reſtore to his ambaſſador the immunities abovementioned [*m*]. INNOCENT, on the other hand, perſiſted in his purpoſe, oppoſed the king's demands in the moſt open and intrepid manner, and could not be wrought upon by any conſideration to yield, even in appearance, to his ambitious adverſary [*n*]. His death, however, put an end to this long debate, which had proved really detrimental to both of the contending parties. His ſucceſſors, being men of a ſofter and more complaiſant diſpoſition, were leſs averſe to the conceſſions that were neceſſary to bring about a reconciliation, and to the meaſures that were adapted to remove the chief cauſes of theſe unſeemly conteſts. They were not, indeed, ſo far unmindful of the papal dignity, and of the intereſts of *Rome*, as to patch up an agreement on inglorious terms. On the one hand, the right of *aſylum* was ſuppreſſed with the king's conſent; on the other, the right of the *regale* was ſettled with

---

☞ [*l*] This *right of aſylum* extended much further than the ambaſſador's palace, whoſe immunity the pope did not mean to violate; it comprehended a conſiderable extent of ground, which was called a *quarter*, and undoubtedly gave occaſion to great and crying abuſes.

☞ [*m*] The Marquis DE LAVARDIN began his embaſſy by entering *Rome*, ſurrounded with a thouſand men in arms.

[*n*] JAEGERI *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtic.* Sæc. xvii. Decenn. ix. p. 19.—*Legatio* LAVARDINI, which was publiſhed in 1688.—But above all, *Memoires de la Reine* CHRISTINE, tom. ii. p. 248. For CHRISTINA took part in this conteſt, and adopted the cauſe of the French monarch.

with certain modifications [o]. The four famous *propoſitions*, relating to the pope's authority and juriſdiction, were ſoftened, by the king's permiſſion, in private letters addreſſed to the pontif by certain biſhops; but they were neither abrogated by the prince, nor renounced by the clergy; on the contrary, they ſtill remain in force, and occupy an eminent place among the laws of the kingdom.

Whether or no the papal authority gained ground in this century.

XXIII. [p] Several Proteſtant writers of eminent merit and learning, lament the acceſſions of power and authority which the Roman pontifs are ſuppoſed to have gained in France during the courſe of this century. They tell us, with ſorrow, that the Italian notions of the papal majeſty and juriſdiction, which the French nation had, in former ages, looked upon with abhorrence, gained ground now; and had infected not only the nobility and clergy, but almoſt all ranks and orders of men; and from hence they conclude, that the famous *rights and liberties of the Gallican church* have ſuffered greatly by the perfidious ſtratagems of the Jeſuits. They are led into this opinion by certain meaſures that were taken by the French court, and which ſeemed to favour the pretenſions of the Roman pontif. They are confirmed in it by the declamations of the Janſeniſts, and other modern writers among the French, who complain of the high veneration that was paid to the papal bulls during this century; of the ſucceſs of the Jeſuits in inſtilling into the mind of the king and his counſellors the maxims of *Rome*, and an exceſſive attachment to its biſhop;

---

[o] See FLEURY, *Inſtitutions du Droit Eccleſiaſtique François*, which excellent work is tranſlated into Latin. ☞ Dr. MOSHEIM refers to p. 454. of the Latin verſion.

☞ [p] This § xxiii. contains the ample note [l], which is to be found at p. 880, of the original. It comes in here with more propriety.

of the violence and ill treatment that were offered to all thoſe who adhered ſtedfaſtly to the doctrine and maxims of their forefathers; and of the gradual attempts that were made to introduce the formidable tribunal of the *inquiſition* into *France*. But it will perhaps appear, on mature conſideration, that too much ſtreſs is laid, by many, on theſe complaints; and that the *rights and privileges* of the Gallican church were in this century, and are actually at this day, in the ſame ſtate and condition in which we find them during thoſe earlier ages, of which the writers and declaimers abovementioned inceſſantly boaſt. It might be aſked, where are the victories that are ſaid to have been obtained over the French by the popes of *Rome*, and which ſome Proteſtant doctors, lending a credulous ear to the complaints of the Janſeniſts and *Appellants*, think they perceive with the utmoſt clearneſs? I am perſuaded it would be difficult, if not impoſſible, to give a ſatisfactory anſwer in the affirmative to this queſtion.

It is true, indeed, that as the tranſactions of government, in general, are now carried on in *France*, with more ſubtilty, ſecreſy, and art, than in former times; ſo, in particular, the ſtratagems and machinations of the Roman pontifs have been oppoſed and defeated with more artifice, and leſs noiſe, than in thoſe more rude and unpoliſhed ages, when almoſt every conteſt was terminated by brutal force and open violence. The oppoſition between the court of *France* and the biſhop of *Rome* ſtill ſubſiſts; but the manner of terminating their differences is changed; and their debates are carried on with leſs clamour, though not certainly with leſs animoſity and vigour, than in the times of old. This new and prudent manner of diſputing is not agreeable to the reſtleſs, fiery, and impatient temper of the French, who have an irreſiſtible propenſity to noiſy, clamorous, and expeditious proceedings; and hence undoubtedly ariſe all the complaints we have heard, and ſtill hear, of the decline of the liberties of the Gallican church, in conſequence of the growing influence and perfidious counſels of the Jeſuits. If thoſe, however, who are accuſtomed to make theſe complaints, would for a moment ſuſpend their prejudices, and examine with attention the hiſtory, and alſo the preſent ſtate of their country, they would ſoon perceive that their eccleſiaſtical *liberties* [q], inſtead of declining, or of being neglected by their monarchs, are maintained and preſerved with more care, reſolution, and foreſight, than ever. It muſt indeed be acknowledged, that, in *France*, there are multitudes of cringing ſlaves, who baſely fawn upon the Roman pontifs, exalt their prerogatives, revere their majeſty, and, through the dictates of ſuperſtition, intereſt, or ambition, are ever ready to hug the papal chain, and ſubmit their necks blindly to the yoke of thoſe ghoſtly tyrants. But it may be proved by the moſt undoubted facts, and by innumerable examples, that theſe ſervile creatures of the pope abounded as much in *France* in former ages as they do at this day; and it muſt be alſo conſidered, that it is not by the counſels of this ſlaviſh tribe that the ſprings of government are moved, or the affairs of ſtate and church tranſacted. It muſt be further acknowledged,

---

☞ [q] It is not neceſſary to advertiſe the reader, that by theſe *liberties* are not meant, that rational and Chriſtian liberty which entitles every individual to follow the light of his own conſcience and the dictates of his own judgment in religious matters; for no ſuch liberty is allowed in *France*. The *liberties* of the *Gallican church* conſiſt in the oppoſition which that church has made, at different times, to the overgrown power of the Roman pontif, and to his pretended *perſonal* infallibility.

that the Jeſuits had arrived at a very high degree of influence and authority [r], and ſometimes have credit enough to promote meaſures that do not at all appear conſiſtent with the rights of the Gallican church, and muſt conſequently be conſidered as heavy grievances by the patrons of the ancient eccleſiaſtical liberty. But here it may be obſerved, on the one hand, that many ſuch meaſures have been propoſed and followed before the riſe of the Jeſuits; and, on the other, that many affairs of great conſequence are daily tranſacted in a manner highly diſpleaſing and detrimental to that ſociety, and extremely diſagreeable to the Roman pontifs. If it be alleged, that thoſe who defend with learning and judgment the ancient doctrines and maxims of the Gallican church ſcarcely eſcape public cenſure and puniſhment, and that thoſe who maintain them with vehemence and intemperate zeal are frequently rewarded with exile or a priſon; nay, that the moſt humble and modeſt patrons of theſe doctrines are left in obſcurity without encouragement or recompence: all this muſt be granted. But it muſt be conſidered, on the other hand, that the cauſe they maintain, and the ancient doctrines and maxims they defend, are not condemned, nor even deſerted; the matter is only this, that the prince and his miniſtry have fallen upon a new method of maintaining and ſupporting them. It appears to them much more conducive to public peace and order, that the ſtratagems and attempts of the Roman pontifs ſhould

---

☞ [r] Dr. MOSHEIM wrote this in the year 1753, before the ſuppreſſion of the Order of Jeſuits in *France*. The downfal of that ſociety, and the circumſtances that have attended it, ſeem both to illuſtrate and confirm his judicious notion with reſpect to the degree of credit and influence which the popes have had in that kingdom for ſome time paſt.

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I.

be oppoſed and defeated by ſecret exertions of reſolution and vigour, without noiſe or oſtentation, than by learned productions and clamorous diſputes; which, for the moſt part, excite factions in the kingdom, inflame the ſpirits of the people, throw the ſtate into tumult and confuſion, exaſperate the pontiffs, and alienate them ſtill more and more from the French nation. In the mean time the doctors and profeſſors, who are placed in the various ſeminaries of learning, are left at liberty to inſtruct the youth in the ancient doctrine and diſcipline of the church, and to explain and inculcate thoſe maxims and laws by which, in former times, the papal authority was reſtrained and confined within certain limits. If theſe laws and maxims are infringed, and if even violent methods are employed againſt thoſe who adhere ſtedfaſtly to them, this happens but very rarely, and never but when ſome caſe of extreme neceſſity, or the proſpect of ſome great advantage to the community, abſolutely require their ſuſpenſion. Beſides, thoſe who ſit at the political helm, always take care to prevent the pope's reaping much benefit from this ſuſpenſion or neglect of the ancient laws and maxims of the church. This circumſtance, which is of ſo much importance in the preſent queſtion, muſt appear evident to ſuch as will be at the pains to look into the hiſtory of the debates that attended, and the conſequencs that followed, the reception of the *Bull Unigenitus* in *France*, than which no papal edict could ſeem more repugnant to the rights and liberties of the Gallican church. But in the buſineſs of this *Bull*, as in other tranſactions of a like nature, the court proceeded upon this political maxim, that a ſmaller evil is to be ſubmitted to, when a greater may be thereby prevented.

In a word, the kings of *France* have almoſt always treated the Roman pontifs as the heroes, who are ſaid, in Pagan ſtory, to have deſcended into *Tartarus*, behaved towards the triple-jawed guardian of that lower region: ſometimes they offered a ſoporiferous cake to ſuppreſs his grumbling and menacing tone; at others they terrified him with their naked ſwords, and the din of arms; and this with a view to ſtop his barking, and to obtain the liberty of directing their courſe in the manner they thought proper. There is nothing invidious deſigned by this compariſon, which certainly repreſents, in a lively manner, the careſſes and threatenings that were employed by the *French* monarchs, according to the nature of the times, the ſtate of affairs, the character of the pontifs, and other incidental circumſtances, in order to render the court of *Rome* favourable to their deſigns. We have dwelt, perhaps, too much upon this ſubject; but we thought it not improper to undeceive many Proteſtant writers, who, too much influenced by the bitter complaints and declamations of certain Janſeniſts, and not ſufficiently inſtructed in the hiſtory of theſe eccleſiaſtical contentions, have formed erroneous notions concerning the point we have here endeavoured to examine and diſcuſs.

The ſtate of the Romiſh clergy.

XXIV. The corruptions that had been complained of in preceding ages, both in the higher and inferior Orders of the Romiſh clergy, were rather increaſed than diminiſhed during this century, as the moſt impartial writers of that communion candidly confeſs. The biſhops were rarely indebted for their elevation to their eminent learning or ſuperior merit. The interceſſion of potent patrons, ſervices rendered to men in power, connections of blood, and ſimoniacal practices, were, generally ſpeaking, the ſteps to preferment; and, what was ſtill more deplorable, their

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I.

their promotion was ſometimes owing to their vices. Their lives were ſuch, as might be expected from perſons who had riſen in the church by ſuch unſeemly means; for had they been obliged, by their profeſſion, to give public examples of thoſe vices which the holy laws of the Goſpel ſo ſolemnly and expreſsly condemn, inſtead of exhibiting patterns of ſanctity and virtue to their flock, they could not have conducted themſelves otherwiſe than they did [s]. Some indeed there were, who, ſenſible of the obligations of their profeſſion, diſplayed a true Chriſtian zeal, in adminiſtering uſeful inſtruction, and exhibiting pious examples to their flock, and exerted their utmoſt vigour and activity in oppoſing the vices of the ſacred Order in particular, and the licentiouſneſs of the times in general. But theſe rare patrons of virtue and piety were either ruined by the reſentment and ſtratagems of their envious and exaſperated brethren, or were left in obſcurity, without that encouragement and ſupport that were requiſite to enable them to execute effectually their pious and laudable purpoſes. The ſame treatment fell to the lot of thoſe among the lower order of the clergy, who endeavoured to maintain the cauſe of truth and virtue. But the number of ſufferers in this noble cauſe was ſmall, compared with the multitude of corrupt eccleſiaſtics, who were carried away with the torrent, inſtead of oppoſing it, and whoſe lives were ſpent in ſcenes of pleaſure, or in the anxiety and toils of avarice and ambition. While we acknowledge that, among the biſhops and inferior clergy; there were ſeveral exceptions from that general prevalence of immorality and licentiouſneſs with which the ſacred Order was chargeable; it is alſo incumbent upon us to do juſtice to the merit of ſome of the Roman pontifs, in this century, who uſed their moſt zealous endeavours to reform the manners of the clergy, or, at leaſt, to oblige them to obſerve the rules of external decency in their conduct and converſation. It is however matter of ſurpriſe, that theſe pontifs did not perceive the unſurmountable obſtacles to the ſucceſs of their counſels, and the fruits of their wiſe and ſalutary edicts, that aroſe from the internal conſtitution of the Romiſh church, and the very nature of the papal government. For were the Roman pontifs even divinely inſpired, and really infallible, yet unleſs this inſpiration and infallibility were attended with a miraculous power; and with the ſupernatural privilege of being preſent in many places at the ſame time; it is not conceivable how they ſhould ever entertain a notion of the poſſibility of reſtoring or maintaining order, or good morals, among that prodigious multitude of perſons of all claſſes and characters that are ſubject to their juriſdiction.

---

[s] The reader may ſee theſe diſagreeable accounts of the corruptions of the clergy confirmed by a great number of unexceptionable teſtimonies, drawn from the writings of the moſt eminent doctors of the Romiſh church, in the *Memoires de Port Royal*, tom. ii. p. 308.

The ſtate of the monaſtic Orders.

XXV. Though the monks, in ſeveral places, behaved with much more circumſpection and decency than in former times, yet they had every where departed, in a great meaſure, from the ſpirit of their founders, and the primitive laws of their reſpective inſtitutions. About the commencement of this century, their convents and colleges made a moſt wretched and deplorable figure, as we learn from the accounts of the wiſeſt and moſt learned even of their own writers. But we find, further on, ſeveral attempts made to remove this diſorder. The firſt were made by ſome wiſe and pious Benedictines, who, in *France*, and other countries, *reformed* ſeveral monaſteries of their

Order, and endeavoured to bring them back, as near as was poſſible, to the laws and diſcipline of their founder [t]. Their example was followed by the monks of *Clugni*, the Ciſtercians, the regular canons, the Dominicans, and Franciſcans [u]. It is from this period that we are to date the diviſion of the monaſtic Orders into two general claſſes; one of theſe comprehends the *Reformed* monks, who, reclaimed from that licentiouſneſs and corruption of manners that had formerly diſhonoured their ſocieties, lead more ſtrict and regular lives, and diſcover in their conduct a greater regard to the primitive laws of their Order. The other is compoſed of the *Un-reformed* Orders, who, forgetting the ſpirit of their founders, and the rules of their inſtitute, ſpend their days in eaſe and pleaſure, and have no taſte for the auſterities and hardſhips of the monaſtic life. The latter claſs is by far the moſt numerous; and the greateſt part, even of the *Reformed* monks, do not only come ſhort of that purity of manners which their *rule* enjoins, but are moreover gradually and imperceptibly relapſing into their former indolence and diſorder.

---

[t] LE BOEUF, *Memoires ſur l'Hiſtoire d'Auxerre*, tom. ii, p. 513. where there is an account of the firſt *Reforms* made in the convents during this century.—See MARTENE's *Voyage Litteraire de deux Benedictins*, par. II. p. 97.

[u] There is an account of all the convents reformed in this century, in HELYOT's *Hiſtoire des Ordres*, tom. v, vi, vii. to which, however, ſeveral intereſting circumſtances may be added, by conſulting other writers. The *Reform* of the Monks of *Clugni* is amply deſcribed by the Benedictines, in the *Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. vii. p. 544. The ſame authors ſpeak of the *Reform* of the *Regular Canons of St.* AUGUSTIN, tom. vii. p. 778. 787. 790.—For an account of that of the *Ciſtercians*, ſee MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 121.—*Voyage Litteraire de deux Benedictins*, tom. i. p. 7, 8. tom. ii. p. 133. 229. 269. 303. The *Ciſtercians* were no ſooner *reformed* themſelves, than they uſed their moſt zealous endeavours for the reformation of the whole ſociety (*i. e.* of the Benedictine Order), but in vain. See MEAUPOU, *Vie de l'Abbé de la Trappe*, tom. i. p. 192.

The Congregation of *St. Maur.*

XXVI. Among the *Reformed* monks, a particular degree of attention is due to certain Benedictine ſocieties, or *congregations*, who ſurpaſs all the other monaſtic Orders, both in the excellence and utility of their rules and conſtitution, and in the zeal and perſeverance with which they adhere to them. The moſt famous of theſe ſocieties is the *Congregation of St. Maur* [w], which was founded in the year 1620, by the expreſs order of GREGORY XV., and was enriched by URBAN VIII., in the year 1627, with ſeveral donations and privileges. It does not indeed appear, that even this ſociety adheres ſtrictly to the ſpirit and maxims of BENEDICT, whoſe name it bears, nor is it beyond the reach of cenſure in other reſpects; but theſe imperfections are compenſated by the great number of excellent rules and inſtitutions that are obſerved in it, and by the regular lives and learned labours of its members. For in this congregation there is a ſelect number of perſons, who are diſtinguiſhed by their genius and talents, ſet apart for the ſtudy of ſacred and profane literature, and more eſpecially of hiſtory and antiquities; and this learned part of the ſociety is furniſhed with all the means and materials of knowledge in a rich abundance, and with every thing that can tend to facilitate their labours and render them ſucceſsful [x]. It muſt be abundantly known, to thoſe who have any acquaintance with the hiſtory and progreſs of learning in *Europe*, what ſignal advantages the republic of letters has derived from the eſtabliſhment of this famous *Congregation*, whoſe numerous and admirable productions have caſt a great light upon all the various branches of philology and *Belles Lettres*, and whoſe reſearches have taken in the whole circle of ſcience, philoſophy excepted [*y*].

---

[w] See the *Gallia Chriſtiana Nova*, an admirable work, compoſed by the *Congregation of St. Maur*, tom. vii. p. 474.— HELYOT, *Hiſtoire des Ordres*, tom. vi. cap. xxxvii. p. 256. The letters patent of Pope GREGORY XV., by which the eſtabliſhment of this famous congregation was approved and confirmed, were criticiſed with great ſeverity and rigour by LAUNOY, that formidable ſcourge of all the Monaſtic Orders, in his *Examen privil. S. Germani*, tom. iii. p. i. opp. p. 303. The ſame author gives an account of the diſſenſions that aroſe in this *congregation* immediately after its eſtabliſhment; but an account which favours too much of that partiality that he was chargeable with, whenever he treated of monaſtic affairs; ſee his *Aſſert. Inquiſit. in privil. S. Medardi*, p. i. cap. lxxvi. p. 227. tom. iii. opp. p. 2.

---

[x] The Benedictines celebrate, in pompous terms, the exploits of this *congregation* in general, and more eſpecially their zealous and ſucceſsful labours in reſtoring order, diſcipline, and virtue, in a great number of monaſteries, which were falling into ruin through the indolence and corruption of their licentious members; See the *Voyage de deux Religieux Benedictins de la Congregation de S. Maur*, tom. i. p. 16. tom. ii. p. 47. This eulogy, though perhaps exaggerated, is not entirely unmerited; and there is no doubt but the Benedictiues have contributed much to reſtore the credit of the monaſtic Orders. There are, neverthleſs, ſeveral claſſes of eccleſiaſtics in the Romiſh church, who are no well-wiſhers to this learned *congregation*, though their diſlike be founded on different reaſons. In the firſt claſs, we may place a certain number of ambitious prelates, whoſe artful purpoſes have been diſappointed by this ingenious fraternity; for the monks of *St. Maur*, having turned their principal ſtudy towards ancient hiſtory and antiquities of every kind, and being perfectly acquainted with ancient records, diplomas, and charters, are thus peculiarly qualified to maintain their poſſeſſions, their juriſdiction, and privileges, againſt the litigious pretenſions of the biſhops, and have, in fact, maintained them with more ſucceſs than their Order could do in former times, when deſtitute of learning, or but ill furniſhed with the knowledge of ancient hiſtory. The Jeſuits form the ſecond claſs of adverſaries, with whom this learned *congregation* has been obliged to ſtruggle; for their luſtre and reputation being conſiderably eclipſed by the numerous and admirable productions of theſe Benedictines, they have uſed their utmoſt endeavours to ſink, or at leaſt to diminiſh, the credit of ſuch formidable rivals. See SIMON, *Lettres Choiſies*, tom. iv. p. 36. 45. Theſe Benedictines have a third ſet of enemies, who are inſtigated by ſuperſtition; and it is not improbable, that this ſuperſtition may be accompanied with a certain mixture of envy. To underſtand this fully, it muſt be obſerved, that the learned Monks, of whom we are now ſpeaking, have ſubſtituted an aſſiduous application to the culture of philology and literature in the place of that bodily and manual labour which the *Rule of St.* BENEDICT preſcribes to his followers. The more robuſt, healthy, and vigorous Monks, are obliged to employ a certain portion of the day in working with their hands; while thoſe of a weaker conſtitution, and ſuperior genius, are allowed to exchange bodily for mental

---

mental labour, and, inſtead of cultivating the lands or gardens of the convent, to ſpend their days in the purſuit of knowledge, both human and divine. The lazy Monks envy this bodily repoſe; and the ſuperſtitious and fanatical ones, who are vehemently prejudiced in favour of the ancient monaſtic diſcipline, behold, with contempt, theſe learned reſearches as unbecoming the monaſtic character, ſince they tend to divert the mind from divine contemplation. This ſuperſtitious and abſurd opinion was maintained, with peculiar warmth and vehemence, by ARMAND JOHN BOUTHELIER DE RANCÉ, abbot of *La Trappe*, in his book *Des devoirs monaſtiques;* upon which the Benedictines employed MABILLON, the moſt learned of their fraternity, to defend their cauſe, and to expoſe the reveries of the abbot in their proper colours. This he did with remarkable ſucceſs, in his famous book *De Studiis monaſticis*, which was firſt publiſhed in 8vo at *Paris* in the year 1691, paſſed afterwards through ſeveral editions, and was tranſlated into different languages. Hence aroſe that celebrated queſtion, which was long debated with great warmth and animoſity in *France*, viz. *How far a monk may, conſiſtently with his character, apply himſelf to the ſtudy of literature?* There is an elegant and intereſting hiſtory of this controverſy given by VINCENT THULLIER, a moſt learned monk of the congregation of *St. Maur;* ſee the *Opera Poſthuma* MABILLONII *et* RUINARTII, tom. i. p. 365—425.

[*y*] The curious reader will find an account of the authors and learned productions with which the congregation of *St. Maur* has enriched the republic of letters, in PH. LE CERF's *Bibliothéque Hiſtorique et Critique des Auteurs de la Congregation de St. Maur*, publiſhed at the *Hague* in 8vo in 1726; and alſo in BERNARD PEZ's *Bibliotheca Benedictino-Mariana*, publiſhed in 8vo at *Augſbourg* in 1716.—Theſe Benedictines ſtill maintain their literary fame by the frequent publication of laborious and learned productions in all the various branches of ſacred and profane literature.

XXVII. Though theſe pious attempts to reform the monaſteries were not entirely unſucceſsful, yet the effects they produced, even in thoſe places where they had ſucceeded moſt, came far ſhort of that perfection of auſterity that had ſeized the imaginations of a ſet of perſons, whoſe number is conſiderable in the Romiſh church, though their credit be ſmall, and their ſeverity be generally looked upon as exceſſive and diſguſting. Theſe rigid cenſors, having always in their eye the ancient diſcipline of the monaſtic Orders, and bent on reducing the modern convents to that auſtere diſcipline, looked upon the changes abovementioned as imperfect and trifling. They conſidered a monk as a perſon obliged, by the ſanctity of his profeſſion, to ſpend his whole days in prayers, tears, contemplation, and ſilence; in the peruſal of holy books, and the hardſhips of bodily labour; nay, they went ſo far as to maintain, that all other deſigns, and all other occupations, however laudable and excellent in themſelves, were entirely foreign from the monaſtic vocation, and, on that account, vain and ſinful in perſons of that Order. This ſevere plan of monaſtic diſcipline was recommended by ſeveral perſons, whoſe obſcurity put it out of their power to influence many in its behalf; but it was alſo adopted by the Janſeniſts, who reduced it to practice in certain places [z], and in none with more ſucceſs and reputation than in the female convent of *Port-Royal*, where it has ſubſiſted from the year 1618 until our time [*a*]. Theſe ſteps of the Janſeniſts excited a ſpirit of emulation, and ſeveral monaſteries exerted themſelves in the imitation of this auſtere model; but they were all ſurpaſſed by the famous BOUTHILLIER DE RANCE, abbot *de la Trappe* [*b*], who, with the moſt ardent zeal, and indefatigable labour, attended with uncommon ſucceſs, introduced into his monaſtery this diſcipline, in all its auſtere and ſhocking perfection. This abbot, ſo illuſtrious by his birth, and ſo remarkable for his extraordinary devotion, was ſo happy as to vindicate his fraternity from the charge of exceſſive ſuperſtition, which the Janſeniſts had drawn upon themſelves by the auſterity of their monaſtic diſcipline; and yet his ſociety obſerved the ſevere and laborious rule of the ancient Ciſtercians, whom they even ſurpaſſed in abſtinence, mortifications, and ſelf-denial. This Order ſtill ſubſiſts, under the denomination of the *Reformed Bernardins of La Trappe*, and has ſeveral monaſteries both in *Spain* and *Italy*; but, if credit may be given to the accounts of writers who ſeem to be well informed, it is degenerating gradually from the auſtere and painful diſcipline of its famous founder [*c*].

---

[z] See the *Memoires de Port-Royal*, tom. ii. p. 601, 602.—MARTIN BARCOS, the moſt celebrated Janſeniſt of this century, introduced this auſtere rule of diſcipline into the monaſtery of *St. Cyran*, of which he was abbot. See the *Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. ii. p. 132.—MOLEON, *Voyages Liturgiques*, p. 135. But, after the death of this famous abbot, the monks of his cloyſter relapſed into their former diſorder, and reſumed their former manners. See *Voyage de deux Benedictins*, tom. i. p. i. p. 18.

[*a*] HELYOT, *Hiſtoire des Ordres*, tom. v. chap. xliv. p. 455.

☞ [*b*] This illuſtrious abbot ſhewed very early an extraordinary genius for the *Belles Lettres*. At the age of ten, he was maſter of ſeveral of the Greek and Roman poets, and underſtood HOMER perfectly. At the age of twelve or thirteen, he gave an edition of *Anacreon*, with learned Annotations. Some writers allege, that he had imbibed the voluptuous ſpirit of that poet, and that his ſubſequent application to the ſtudy of theology in the *Sorbonne* did not extinguiſh it entirely. They alſo attribute his converſion to a ſingular incident. They tell us, that returning from the country, after ſix weeks abſence from a lady whom he loved paſſionately (and not in vain), he went directly to her chamber by a back ſtair, without having the patience to make any previous enquiry about her health and ſituation. On opening the door, he found the chamber illuminated, and hung with black;—and, on approaching the bed,—ſaw the moſt hideous ſpectacle that could be preſented to his eyes, and the moſt adapted to mortify paſſion, inſpire horror, and engender the gloom of melancholy devotion, in a mind too lively and too much agitated to improve this ſhocking change to the purpoſes of rational piety: he ſaw his fair miſtreſs in her ſhroud—dead of the ſmall-pox—all her charms fled—and ſucceeded by the ghaſtly lines of death, and the frightful marks of that terrible diſorder.—From that moment, it is ſaid, our abbot retired from the world, repaired to *La Trappe*, the moſt gloomy, barren, and deſolate ſpot in the whole kingdom of *France*, and there ſpent the forty laſt years of his life in perpetual acts of the moſt auſtere piety.

New monaſtic orders founded.

XXVIII. The Romiſh church, from whoſe prolific womb all the various forms of ſuperſtition iſſued forth in an amazing abundance, ſaw ſeveral new monaſtic eſtabliſhments ariſe within its borders during this century. The greateſt part of them we ſhall paſs over in ſilence, and confine ourſelves to the mention of thoſe which have obtained ſome degree of fame, or at leaſt made a certain noiſe in the world.

We begin with the *Fathers of the oratory of the Holy Jeſus*, a famous Order, inſtituted by Cardinal BERULLE, a man of genius and talents, who diſplayed his abilities with ſuch ſucceſs, in the ſervice both of ſtate and church, that he was generally looked upon as equally qualified for ſhining in theſe very different ſpheres. This Order, which both in the nature of its rules, and in the deſign of its eſtabliſhment, ſeems to be in direct oppoſition to that of the Jeſuits, was founded in the year 1613, has produced a conſiderable number of perſons

---

[*c*] MARSOLIER, *Vie de l'Abbé de la Trappe*, publiſhed at *Paris* in 1702 in 4to, and in 1703 in 2 vols. 12mo.—MEAUPOU, *Vie de M. l'Abbé de la Trappe*, publiſhed at *Paris* in 2 vols. 8vo, in 1702.—FELIBIEN, *Deſcription de l'Abbaye de la Trappe*, publiſhed at *Paris* in 1671.—HELYOT, *Hiſtoire des Ordres*, tom. vi. chap. i. p. 1.

ſons eminent for their piety, learning, and eloquence, and ſtill maintains its reputation in this reſpect. Its members however have, on account of certain theological productions, been ſuſpected of introducing new opinions; and this ſuſpicion has not only been raiſed, but is alſo induſtriouſly fomented and propagated, by the Jeſuits. The prieſts who enter into this ſociety are not obliged to renounce their property or poſſeſſions, but only to refuſe all eccleſiaſtical cures or offices to which any fixed revenues or honours are annexed, as long as they continue members of this fraternity, from which they are, however, at liberty to retire whenever they think proper [*d*]. While they continue in the Order, they are bound to perform, with the greateſt fidelity and accuracy, all the prieſtly functions, and to turn the whole bent of their zeal and induſtry to one ſingle point, even the preparing and qualifying themſelves and others for diſcharging them daily with greater perfection, and more abundant fruits. If, therefore, we conſider this Order in the original end of its inſtitution, its convents may, not improperly, be called the ſchools of *ſacerdotal divinity* [*e*]. It is nevertheleſs to be obſerved, that, in later times,

---

☞ [*d*] The *Fathers* or *Prieſts* (as they are alſo called) *of the oratory*, are not, properly ſpeaking, *religious* or monks, being bound by no *vows*, and their inſtitute being purely eccleſiaſtical or ſacerdotal.

[*e*] See HABERT DE CERISI, *Vie du Cardinal* BERULLE, *fondateur de l'Oratoire de Jeſus*, publiſhed at *Paris* in 4to in the year 1646.—MORINI *Vita Antiqq.* prefixed to his *Orientalia*, p. 3, 4, 5. 110.—R. SIMON, *Lettres Choiſies*, tom. ii. p. 60. et *Bibliothéque Critique* (publiſhed under the fictitious name of *Saint Jorre)*, tom. iii. p. 303. 324. 330. For an account of the genius and capacity of BERULLE, ſee BAILLEE, *Vie de* RICHER, p. 220—342.—LE VASSOR, *Hiſtoire de* LOUIS XIII., tom. iii. p. 397.—HELYOT, *Hiſtoire des Ordres*, tom. viii. chap. x. p. 53.—*Gallia Chriſtiana Benedictinor.* tom. vii. p. 976.

the Fathers of the Oratory have not confined themſelves to this ſingle object, but have imperceptibly extended their original plan, and applied themſelves to the ſtudy of polite literature and theology, which they teach with reputation in their colleges [*f*].

After theſe *Fathers*, the next place is due to the *Prieſts of the Miſſions*, an Order founded by VINCENT DE PAUL (who has obtained, not long ago, the honours of ſaintſhip), and formed into a regular congregation, in the year 1632, by Pope URBAN VIII. The rule preſcribed to this ſociety, by its founder, lays its members under the three following obligations: *Firſt*, to purify themſelves, and to aſpire daily to higher degrees of ſanctity and perfection, by prayer, meditation, the peruſal of pious books, and other devout exerciſes: *Secondly*, to employ eight months of the year in the villages, and, in general, among the country-people, in order to inſtruct them in the principles of religion, form them to the practice of piety and virtue, accommodate their differences, and adminiſter conſolation and relief to the ſick and indigent: *Thirdly*, to inſpect and govern the ſeminaries in which perſons deſigned for holy orders receive their education, and to inſtruct the candidates for the miniſtry in the ſciences that relate to their reſpective vocations [*g*].

The *Prieſts of the miſſions* were alſo intruſted with the direction and government of a Female Order called *Virgins of Love*, or *Daughters of Charity*, whoſe office it was to adminiſter aſſiſtance

---

☞ [*f*] *The Fathers of the Oratory* will now be obliged, in a more particular manner, to extend their plan; ſince, by the ſuppreſſion of the Jeſuits in *France*, the education of youth is committed to them.

[*g*] ABELY, *Vie de* VINCENT DE PAUL, publiſhed in 4to at *Paris* in 1664.—HELYOT, *loc. cit.* tom. viii. chap. xi. p. 64.—*Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. vii. p. 998.

and relief to indigent perſons, who were confined to their beds by ſickneſs and infirmity. This Order was founded by a noble virgin, whoſe name was LOUISA LE GRAS, and received, in the year 1660, the approbation of Pope CLEMENT IX. [h].—*The Brethren and Siſters of the pious and Chriſtian ſchools*, who are now commonly called *Pietiſts*, were formed into a ſociety in the year 1678, by NICHOLAS BARRE, and obliged, by their engagements, to devote themſelves to the education of poor children of both ſexes [i]. It would be endleſs to mention all the religious ſocieties which roſe and fell, were formed by fits of zeal, and diſſolved by external incidents, or by their own internal principles of inſtability and decay.

The ſociety of Jeſuits.

XXIX. If the *Company of Jeſus*, ſo called, which may be conſidered as the ſoul of the papal hierarchy, and the main ſpring that directs its motions, had not been invincible, it muſt have ſunk under the attacks of thoſe formidable enemies that, during the courſe of this century, aſſailed it on all ſides and from every quarter. When we conſider the multitude of the adverſaries the *Jeſuits* had to encounter, the heinous crimes with which they were charged, the innumerable affronts they received, and the various calamities in which they were involved, it muſt appear aſtoniſhing that they yet ſubſiſt; and ſtill more ſo, that they enjoy any degree of public eſteem, and are not, on the contrary, ſunk in oblivion, or covered with infamy. In *France*, *Holland*, *Poland*, and *Italy*, they experienced, from time to time, the bitter effects of a warm and vehement oppoſition, and were, both in public and private, accuſed of the greateſt enormities, and charged with maintaining peſtilential errors and maxims, that were equally deſtructive of the temporal and eternal intereſts of mankind, by their tendency to extinguiſh the ſpirit of true religion, and to trouble the order and peace of civil ſociety. The Janſeniſts, and all who eſpouſed their cauſe, diſtinguiſhed themſelves more eſpecially in this oppoſition. They compoſed an innumerable multitude of books, in order to cover the ſons of Loyola with eternal reproach, and to expoſe them to the hatred and ſcorn of the whole univerſe. Nor were theſe productions mere defamatory libels, dictated by malice alone, or pompous declamations, deſtitute of arguments and evidence. On the contrary, they were attended with the ſtrongeſt demonſtration, being drawn from undeniable facts, and confirmed by unexceptionable teſtimonies [k].

---

[h] GOBILLON, *Vie de Madame* DE GRAS, *Fondatrice des Filles de la Charité*, publiſhed in 12mo at *Paris*, in the year 1676.

[i] HELYOT, *Hiſtoire des Ordres*, tom. viii. chap. xxx. p. 233.

---

[k] An account of this oppoſition to, and of theſe conteſts with, the Jeſuits, would furniſh matter for many volumes; ſince there is ſcarcely any Roman Catholic country which has not been the theatre of violent diviſions between the ſons of Loyola, and the magiſtrates, monks, or doctors, of the Romiſh Church. In theſe conteſts, the Jeſuits ſeemed almoſt always to be vanquiſhed; and nevertheleſs, in the iſſue, they always came victorious from the field of controverſy. A Janſeniſt writer propoſed, ſome years ago, to collect into one relation the accounts of theſe conteſts that lie diſperſed in a multitude of books, and to give a complete hiſtory of this famous Order. The firſt volume of his work accordingly appeared at *Utrecht*, in the year 1741, was accompanied with a curious *Preface*, and entitled *Hiſtoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jeſus*. If we may give credit to what this writer tells us of the voyages he undertook, the dangers and difficulties he encountered, and the number of years he ſpent in inveſtigating the proceedings, and in detecting the frauds and artifices, of the Jeſuits, we muſt certainly be perſuaded, that no man could be better qualified for compoſing the hiſtory of this inſidious Order. But this good man, returning imprudently into *France*, was diſcovered by his exaſperated enemies the Jeſuits, and is ſaid

Yet all this was far from overturning that fabric of profound and inſidious policy which the Jeſuits had raiſed, under the protection of the Roman pontifs, and the connivance of deluded princes and nations. It ſeemed, on the contrary, as if the oppoſition of ſuch a multitude of enemies and accuſers had ſtrengthened their intereſt

ſaid to have periſhed miſerably by their hands. Hence not above a third part of his intended work was either publiſhed or finiſhed for the preſs. ☞ Some things may be added, both by way of correction and illuſtration, to what Dr. MOSHEIM has here ſaid concerning this hiſtory of the Jeſuits and its author. In the *firſt place*, its author or compiler is ſtill alive, reſides at the *Hague*, paſſes by the name of BENARD, is ſuppoſed to be a Janſeniſt, and a relation of the famous Father QUENEL, whom the Jeſuits perſecuted with ſuch violence in *France*. He is a native of *France*, and belonged to the oratory. It is alſo true, that he went thither from *Holland* ſeveral years ago; and it was believed, that he had fallen a victim to the reſentment of the Jeſuits, until his return to the *Hague* proved that report falſe. *Secondly*, This hiſtory is carried no further down than the year 1572, notwithſtanding the expreſs promiſes and engagements by which the author bound himſelf, four and twenty years ago (in the Preface to his firſt volume), to publiſh the whole in a very ſhort time, declaring that it was ready for the preſs. This ſuſpenſion is far from being honourable to Mr. BENARD, who is ſtill living at the *Hague*, and conſequently at full liberty to accompliſh his promiſe. This has made ſome ſuſpect, that, though Mr. BENARD is too much out of the Jeſuits reach to be influenced by their threatenings, he is not, however, too far from them to be moved by the eloquence of their promiſes, or ſtedfaſt enough to ſtand out againſt the *weighty* remonſtrances they may have employed to prevent the further publication of his hiſtory. It may be obſerved *thirdly*, that the character of a traveller, who has ſtudied the manners and conduct of the Jeſuits in the moſt remarkable ſcenes of their tranſactions in *Europe*, and the other parts of the globe, is here aſſumed by Mr. BENARD as the moſt pleaſing manner of conveying the accounts which he compiled in his cloſet. Theſe accounts don't appear to be falſe, though the character of a traveller, aſſumed by the compiler, be fictitious. It muſt be allowed, on the contrary, that Mr. BENARD has drawn his relations from good ſources, though his ſtyle and manner cannot well be juſtified from the charge of acrimony and malignity.

inſtead of diminiſhing it, and added to their affluence and proſperity inſtead of bringing on their deſtruction. Amidſt the ſtorm that threatened them with a fatal ſhipwreck, they directed their courſe with the utmoſt dexterity, tranquillity, and prudence. Thus they got ſafe into the deſired harbour, and aroſe to the very ſummit of ſpiritual authority in the church of *Rome*. Avoiding rather than repelling the aſſaults of their enemies, oppoſing for the moſt part patience and ſilence to their redoubled inſults, they proceeded uniformly and ſtedfaſtly to their great purpoſe, and they ſeem to have attained it. For thoſe very nations who formerly looked upon a Jeſuit as a kind of monſter, and as a public peſt, commit, at this day, ſome through neceſſity, ſome through choice, and others through both, a great part of their intereſts and tranſactions to the direction of this moſt artful and powerful ſociety [*l*].

XXX. All

[*l*] It may perhaps be affirmed with truth, that none of the Roman Catholic nations attacked the Jeſuits with more vehemence and animoſity than the French have done upon ſeveral occaſions; and it is certain, that the Jeſuits in that kingdom have been, more than once, involved in great difficulties and diſtreſs. To be convinced of this, the reader has only to conſult DU BOULAY's *Hiſtoria Academiæ Pariſienſis*, tom. vi. p. 559. 648. 676. 738. 742. 744. 763. 774. 874. 890. 898. 909. in which he will find an ample and accurate account of the reſolutions and tranſactions of the Parliament and Univerſity of *Paris*, and alſo of the proceedings of the people in general, to the detriment of this artful and dangerous ſociety. But what was the final iſſue of all theſe reſolutions and tranſactions, and in what did all this oppoſition end? I anſwer, in the exaltation and grandeur of the Jeſuits. They had been baniſhed with ignominy out of the kingdom, and were recalled from their exile, and honourably reſtored to their former credit, in the year 1604, under the reign of HENRY IV., notwithſtanding the remonſtrances of many perſons of the higheſt rank and dignity, who were ſhocked beyond expreſſion at this unaccountably mean and ignoble ſtep. See *Memoires de* SULLY (the modern edition publiſhed at *Geneva)*, tom. 5. p. 83. 314.

After

The ſtate of learning in the church of *Rome*.

XXX. All the different branches of literature received, during this century, in the more poliſhed Roman-Catholic countries, a new degree of luſtre and improvement. *France*, *Spain*, *Italy*, and the *Netherlands*, produced ſeveral men eminent for their genius, erudition, and acquaintance with the learned languages. This happy circumſtance muſt not, however, be attributed to the labour of the ſchools, or to the methods and procedure of public education; for the old, dry, perplexing, inelegant, ſcholaſtic method of inſtruction prevailed then, and indeed ſtill takes place in both the higher and lower ſeminaries of learning; and it is the peculiar tendency of this method to damp genius, to depreſs, inſtead of exciting and encouraging, the generous efforts of the mind towards the purſuit of truth, and to load the memory with a multitude of inſignificant words and uſeleſs diſtinctions. It was beyond the borders of theſe pedantic ſeminaries, that genius was encouraged, and directed by great and eminent patrons of ſcience, who opened new paths to the attainment of ſolid learning, and preſented the ſciences under a new and engaging aſpect to the ſtudious youth. It muſt be obſerved here, in juſtice to the French, that they bore a diſtinguiſhed part in this literary reformation.— Excited by their native force of genius, and animated by the encouragement that learning and learned men received from the munificence of LEWIS XIV., they cultivated with ſucceſs almoſt all the various branches of literature, and, rejecting the barbarous jargon of the ſchools, exhibited

---

After that period, they moved the main-ſprings of government both in church and ſtate, and ſtill continue to ſit, though inviſibly, at the helm of both. ☞ The reader muſt again be advertiſed, that this note was written by Dr. MOSHEIM ſome years before the ſuppreſſion of the ſociety of the Jeſuits in *France*.

learning under an elegant and alluring form, and thereby multiplied the number of its votaries and patrons [*m*]. It is well known how much the example and labours of this polite nation contributed to deliver other countries from the yoke of ſcholaſtic bondage.

The ſtate of philoſophy.

XXXI. The Ariſtotelians of this century were a ſet of intricate dialecticians, who had the name of the Stagirite always in their mouths, without the leaſt portion of his genius, or any tolerable knowledge of his ſyſtem; and they maintained their empire in the ſchools, notwithſtanding the attempts that had been made to diminiſh their credit. It was long before the court of *Rome*, which beheld with terror whatever bore the ſmalleſt aſpect of novelty, could think of conſenting to the introduction of a more rational philoſophy, or permit the modern diſcoveries in that noble ſcience to be explained with freedom in the public ſeminaries of learning. This appears ſufficiently from the fate of GALILEI, the famous mathematician of *Florence*, who was caſt into priſon by the court of *Inquiſition*, for adopting the ſentiments of COPERNICUS, in relation to the conſtitution of the ſolar ſyſtem. It is true, indeed, that DES CARTES and GASSENDI [*n*], the one by his new philoſophy, and the other by his admirable writings, gave a mortal wound to the Peripatetics, and excited a ſpirit of liberty and emulation that changed the face of ſcience in *France*. It was under the auſpicious influence of theſe adventurous guides, that ſeveral eminent men of that nation abandoned the perplexed and intricate wilds of the philoſophy that was taught by the modern Ariſtotelians; and, throwing off the ſhackles of mere authority, dared to conſult the dictates of reaſon and experience, in the ſtudy of nature, and in the inveſtigation of truth. Among theſe converts to true philoſophy, ſeveral *Jeſuits*, and a ſtill greater number of *Janſeniſts* and *Prieſts of the Oratory*, diſtinguiſhed themſelves; and, accordingly, we find in this liſt the reſpectable names of MALEBRANCHE, ARNAULD, LAMI, NICOLE, PASCAL, who acquired immortal fame by illuſtrating and improving the doctrine of DES CARTES, and accommodating it to the purpoſes of human life [*o*]. The modeſty, circumſpection, and ſelf-diffidence of GASSENDI, who confeſſed the ſcanty meaſure of his knowledge, and pretended to no other merit than that of pointing out a rational method of arriving at truth, while others boaſted that they had already found it out, rendered him diſagreeable in *France*. The ardent curioſity, the fervor, precipitation, and impatience of that lively people, could not bear the ſlow and cautious method of proceeding that was recommended by the cool wiſdom of this prudent inquirer. They wanted to get at the ſummit of philoſophy, without climbing the ſteps that lead to it.

[*m*] For an ample account of this matter, ſee VOLTAIRE'S *Siècle de* LOUIS XIV., and more eſpecially the *Chapters* in the ſecond volume relative to the *Arts and Sciences*.

[*n*] See GASSENDI *Exercitationes Paradoxæ adverſus Ariſtoteleos*, *Operum*, tom. iii. This ſubtile and judicious work contributed, perhaps, more than any thing elſe, to hurt the cauſe, and ruin the credit, of the Peripatetics.

[*o*] Theſe great men were, indeed, very ill treated by the Peripatetics, on account of their learned and excellent labours. They were accuſed by theſe exaſperated ſcholaſtics of irreligion; and were even charged with Atheiſm by Father HARDOUIN, who was really intoxicated with the large draughts he had taken from the muddy fountains of Peripatetic and Scholaſtic ſcience. See his *Athei Detecti*, in his *Opp. Poſthum.* p. 1. and 1259.—It is eaſy to perceive the reaſons of all this reſentment; ſince the Carteſian ſyſtem, which aimed at reſtoring the authority of reaſon and the light of true philoſophy, was by no means ſo proper to defend the pretenſions of *Rome* and the cauſe of Popery, as the dark and intricate jargon of the Peripatetics.

Towards the concluſion of this century, many eminent men, in *Italy* and in other countries, followed the example of the French, in throwing off the yoke of the Peripatetics, and venturing into the paths that were newly opened for the inveſtigation of truth. This deſertion of the old philoſophy was at firſt attended with that timorouſneſs and ſecrecy that aroſe from apprehenſions of the diſpleaſure and reſentment of the court of *Rome*; but, as ſoon as it was known that the Roman pontifs beheld with leſs indignation and jealouſy the new diſcoveries in metaphyſics, mathematics, and natural philoſophy, than the deſerters broke their chains with greater confidence, and proceeded with greater freedom and boldneſs in the purſuit of truth.

The reſpective merit of Jeſuits, Benedictines, Prieſts of the Oratory, and Janſeniſts, in the cultivation of ſacred and profane literature.

XXXII. After this general account of the ſtate of learning in the Roman-Catholic countries, it will not be improper to point out, in a more particular manner, thoſe of the Romiſh writers, who contributed moſt to the propagation and improvement both of ſacred and profane erudition during the courſe of this century. The Jeſuits were, for a long time, not only poſſeſſed of an undiſputed pre-eminence in this reſpect, but were, moreover, conſidered as almoſt the ſole fountains of univerſal knowledge, and the only religious Order that made any figure in the literary world. And it muſt be confeſſed by all, who are not miſled by want of candour or of proper information, that this famous ſociety was adorned by many perſons of uncommon genius and learning. The names of PETAU, SIRMOND, POUSSINES, LABBE, and ABRAM, will live as long as letters ſhall be held in honour; and even that of HARDOUIN, notwithſtanding the ſingularity of his diſordered fancy, and the extravagance of many of his opinions, will eſcape oblivion.

It is at the ſame time to be obſerved, that the literary glory of the Jeſuits ſuffered a remarkable eclipſe, during the courſe of this century, from the growing luſtre of the *Benedictine* Order, and more eſpecially of the *Congregation of St. Maur*. The Jeſuits were perpetually boaſting of the eminent merit and luſtre of their *ſociety* on the one hand, and expoſing, on the other, to public contempt, the ignorance and ſtupidity of the Benedictines, who, indeed, formerly made a very different figure from what they do at preſent. Their view in this was to form a plauſible pretext for invading the rights of the latter, and engroſſing their ample revenues and poſſeſſions; but the Benedictines reſolved to diſconcert this inſidious project, to wipe off the reproach of ignorance that had heretofore been caſt upon them with too much juſtice, and to diſappoint the rapacious avidity of their enemies, and rob them of their pretexts. For this purpoſe they not only erected ſchools in their monaſteries, for the inſtruction of youth in the various branches of learning and ſcience, but alſo employed ſuch of their ſelect members, as were diſtinguiſhed by their erudition and genius, in compoſing a variety of learned productions, that were likely to ſurvive the waſte of time, adapted to vindicate the honour of the fraternity, and to reduce its enemies to ſilence. This important taſk has been executed with incredible ability and ſucceſs by MABILLON, D'ACHERY, MASSUET, RUINART, BEAUGENDRE, GARNIER, DE LA RUE, MARTENE, MONTFAUCON, and other eminent men of that learned Order. It is to theſe Benedictines that we are indebted for the beſt editions of the Greek and Latin fathers; for the diſcovery of many curious records and ancient documents, that throw a new light upon the hiſtory of remote ages, and upon the antiquities of various countries; for the beſt accounts of ancient tranſactions, whether eccleſiaſtical or political, and of the manners and cuſtoms of the earlieſt times; for the improvement of chronology, and the other branches of literature. In all theſe parts of philology and *Belles Lettres*, the religious Order, now under conſideration, has ſhone with a diſtinguiſhed luſtre, and given ſpecimens of their knowledge, diſcernment, and induſtry, that are worthy of being tranſmitted to the lateſt poſterity. It would be perhaps difficult to aſſign a reaſon for that viſible decline of learning among the Jeſuits, that commenced preciſely at that very period when the Benedictines began to make this eminent figure in the republic of letters. The fact, however, is undeniable; and the Jeſuits have long been at a loſs to produce any one or more of their members who are qualified to diſpute the pre-eminence, or even to claim an equality, with the Benedictines. The latter ſtill continue to ſhine in the various branches of philology, and, almoſt every year, enrich the literary world with productions that furniſh abundant proofs of their learning and induſtry; whereas, if we except a ſingle work, publiſhed by the Jeſuits of *Antwerp*, many years have paſſed ſince the ſons of LOYOLA have given any ſatisfactory proofs of their boaſted learning, or added to the *maſs* of literature any work worthy to be compared with the *labours* of the followers of BENEDICT.

Theſe learned monks excited the emulation of the *Prieſts of the Oratory*, whoſe efforts to reſemble them were far from being deſtitute of ſucceſs. Several members of this latter Order diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their remarkable proficiency in various branches both of ſacred and profane literature. This, to mention no more examples, appears ſufficiently from the writings of MORIN, THOMASSIN, and SIMON, and from that admirable work of CHARLES DE COINTE, entitled *The Eccleſiaſtical Annals of France*. The *Janſeniſts* alſo deſerve a place in the liſt of thoſe who cultivated letters with induſtry and ſucceſs. Many of their productions abound with erudition, nay ſeveral of them excel both in elegance of ſtile and preciſion of method; and it may be ſaid, in general, that their writings were eminently ſerviceable in the inſtruction of youth, and alſo proper to contribute to the progreſs of learning among perſons of riper years. The writings of thoſe who compoſed the community of *Port-Royal* [p], the works of TILLEMONT, ARNAUD, NICOLE, PASCAL, and LANCELOT, with many other elegant and uſeful productions of perſons of this claſs, were undoubtedly an ornament to French literature during this century. The other religious ſocieties, the higher and lower orders of the clergy, had alſo among them men of learning and genius that reflected a luſtre upon the reſpective claſſes to which they belonged. Nor ought this to be a matter of admiration; ſince nothing is more natural than that, in an immenſe multitude of monks and clergy, all poſſeſſed of abundant leiſure for ſtudy, and of the beſt opportunities of improvement, there ſhould be ſome who, unwilling to hide or throw away ſuch a precious talent, would employ with ſucceſs this leiſure, and theſe opportunities, in the culture of the ſciences. It is nevertheleſs certain, that the eminent men who were to be found beyond the limits of the four claſſes already mentioned [q], were few in number, comparatively ſpeaking, and ſcarcely exceeded the liſt that any of theſe claſſes was able to furniſh.

---

[p] *Meſſieurs de Port-Royal* was a general denomination, which comprehended all the Janſeniſt writers, but was however applied, in a more confined and particular ſenſe, to thoſe Janſeniſts who paſſed their days in pious exerciſes and literary purſuits in the retreat of *Port-Royal*, a manſion ſituated at a little diſtance from *Paris*. It is well known, that ſeveral writers of ſuperior genius, extenſive learning, and uncommon eloquence, reſided in this ſanctuary of letters.

The principal authors of the Romiſh communion.

XXXIII. Hence it comes, that the church of *Rome* can produce a long liſt of writers that have ariſen in its boſom, and acquired a ſhining and permanent reputation, by their learned productions. At the head of the eminent authors which we find among the monaſtic orders and the *regular* clergy, muſt be placed the Cardinals BARONIUS and BELLARMINE, who have obtained an immortal name in their church, the one by his laborious *Annals*, and the other by his books of Controverſy. The other writers that belong to this claſs, are—SERRARIUS—FEVARDENTIUS—POSSEVIN—GRETSER—COMBEFIS—NATALIS ALEXANDER—BECAN—SIRMOND—PETAU—POUSSINES—CELLOT—CAUSSIN—MORIN—RENAUD—FRA-PAOLO—PALLAVICINI—LABBE—MAIMBURG—THOMASSIN—SFONDRAT—AGUIRRE—HENRY NORIS—D'ACHERY—MABILLON—HARDOUIN—SIMON—RUINART—MONTFAUCON—GALLONI—SCACCHI—CORNELIUS A LAPIDE—BONFRERE—MENARD—SEGUENOT—BERNARD—LAMY—BOLLAND—HENSCHEN—PAPEBROCH—and others.

The principal among the *ſecular clergy*, who are neither bound by vows, nor attached to any peculiar community and rules of diſcipline, were—PERRON—ESTIUS—LAUNOY—ALBASPINÆUS—PETRUS DE MARCA—RICHLIEU—HOLSTENIUS—BALUZE—BONA—HUET—BOSSUET—FENELON—GODEAU—TILLEMONT—THIERS—DU PIN—LEO ALLATIUS—ZACCAGNI—COTELIER—FILE-

---

[q] The Jeſuits, Benedictines, Prieſts of the Oratory, and Janſeniſts.

SAC—VISCONTI—&c. [r]. This liſt might be conſiderably augmented by adding to it thoſe writers among the laity who diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their theological or literary productions.

The doctrine of the church of *Rome* ſtill more corrupt than in the preceding ages.

XXXIV. If we take an accurate view of the religious ſyſtem of the Romiſh church during this century, both with reſpect to articles of faith and rules of practice, we ſhall find that, inſtead of being improved by being brought ſomewhat nearer to that perfect model of doctrine and morals that is exhibited to us in the Holy Scriptures, it had contracted new degrees of corruption and degeneracy in moſt places, partly by the negligence of the Roman pontifs, and partly by the dangerous maxims and influence of the Jeſuits. This is not only the obſervation of thoſe who have renounced the Romiſh communion, and in the deſpotic ſtyle of that church are called *heretics*; it is the complaint of the wiſeſt and worthieſt part of that communion, of all its members who have a zeal for the advancement of true Chriſtian knowledge and genuine piety.

As to the *doctrinal* part of the Romiſh religion, it is ſaid, and not without foundation, to have ſuffered extremely in the hands of the Jeſuits, who, under the connivance, nay ſometimes by the immediate aſſiſtance of the Roman pontifs, have perverted and corrupted ſuch of the fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity as were left entire by the council of *Trent*. There are not wanting proofs ſufficient to ſupport this charge; inaſmuch as theſe ſubtile and inſidious fathers have manifeſtly endeavoured to diminiſh the authority and importance of the Holy Scriptures, have extolled the power of human nature, changed the ſentiments of many with reſpect to the neceſſity and efficacy of divine grace, repreſented the mediation and ſufferings of CHRIST as leſs powerful and meritorious than they are ſaid to be in the ſacred writings, turned the Roman pontiff into a terreſtrial Deity, and put him almoſt upon an equal footing with the Divine Saviour; and, finally, rendered, as far as in them lies, the truth of the Chriſtian religion dubious, by their fallacious reaſonings, and their ſubtile but pernicious ſophiſtry. The teſtimonies brought to ſupport theſe accuſations by men of weight and merit, particularly among the Janſeniſts, are of very great authority, and it is extremely difficult to refuſe our aſſent to them, when they are impartially examined; but, on the other hand, it may be eaſily proved, that the Jeſuits, inſtead of inventing theſe pernicious doctrines, did no more, in reality, than propagate them as they found them in that ancient form of the Romiſh religion that preceded the Reformation, and was directly calculated to raiſe the authority of the Pope, and the power and prerogatives of the Romiſh church to the very higheſt pitch of deſpotic grandeur. To inculcate this form of doctrine was the direct vocation of the Jeſuits, who were to derive all their credit, opulence, and influence, from their being conſidered as the main ſupport of the papacy, and the peculiar favourites of the Roman pontifs. If the ultimate end and purpoſe of theſe pontifs were to render the church more pure and holy, and to bring it as near as poſſible to the reſemblance of its Divine Founder, and if this were the commiſſion they give to their favourite emiſſaries and doctors, then the Jeſuits would be at liberty to preach a very different doctrine from what they now inculcate. But that liberty cannot be granted to them as long as their principal orders from the papal throne are, to uſe all their diligence and induſtry, to the end that the pontifs may hold what they have acquired, and recover what they have loſt; and that the biſhops and miniſters of the Romiſh church may daily ſee their opulence increaſe, and the limits of their authority extended and enlarged. The chief crime then of the Jeſuits is really this, that they have explained, with more openneſs and perſpicuity, thoſe points which the leading managers in the council of *Trent* had either entirely omitted, or ſlightly mentioned, that they might not ſhock the friends of true religion, who compoſed a part of that famous aſſembly. And here we ſee the true reaſon why the Roman pontifs, notwithſtanding the ardent ſolicitations and remonſtrances that have been employed to arm their juſt ſeverity againſt the Jeſuits, have always maintained that artful Order, and have been ſo deaf to the accuſations of their adverſaries, that no entreaties have been able to perſuade them to condemn their religious principles and tenets, however erroneous in their nature, and pernicious in their effects. On the contrary, the court of *Rome* has always oppoſed, either in a public or clandeſtine manner, all the vigorous meaſures that have been uſed to procure the condemnation and ſuppreſſion of the doctrine of the *Loyolites*; and the Roman pontifs have conſtantly treated all ſuch attempts as the projects of raſh and imprudent men, who, through involuntary ignorance or obſtinate prejudice, were blind to the true intereſt of the church.

---

[r] For a particular account of the reſpective merit of the writers here mentioned, ſee, among other literary hiſtorians, DU PIN's *Hiſtoire des Ecrivains Eccleſiaſtiques*, tom. xvii. xviii. xix.

The foundations of morality ſapped by the Jeſuits.

XXXV. In the ſphere of morals, the Jeſuits made ſtill more dreadful and atrocious inroads than in that of religion. Did we affirm, that they have perverted and corrupted almoſt all the various branches and precepts of morality, we ſhould not expreſs ſufficiently the pernicious tendency of their maxims. Were we to go ſtill further, and maintain, that they have ſapped and deſtroyed its very foundations, we ſhould maintain no more than what innumerable writers of the Romiſh church abundantly teſtify, and what many of the moſt illuſtrious communities of that church publicly lament. Thoſe who bring this dreadful charge againſt the ſons of LOYOLA, have taken abundant precautions to vindicate themſelves againſt the reproach of calumny in this matter. They have publiſhed ſeveral maxims, inconſiſtent with all regard for virtue and even decency, which they have drawn from the moral writings of that Order, and more eſpecially from the numerous productions of its *Caſuiſts*. They obſerve, more particularly, that the whole ſociety adopts and inculcates the following maxims:

"That perſons *truly wicked*, and *void of the* " *love of God*, may expect to obtain *eternal life* in " heaven, provided that they be impreſſed with a " fear of the Divine anger, and avoid all heinous " and enormous crimes *through the dread of future* " *puniſhment*:

"That thoſe perſons may tranſgreſs *with ſafety*, " who have a *probable reaſon* for tranſgreſſing, *i. e.* " any plauſible argument or authority in favour " of the ſin they are inclined to commit [s]:

"That

☞ [s] This is one of the moſt corrupt and moſt dangerous maxims of the Jeſuits. On the one hand, they have among them doctors of different characters and different principles, that thus they may render their ſociety recommendable in the eyes of all ſorts of perſons, the licentious as well as the auſtere. On the other, they maintain, that an *opinion* or *practice*, recommended by any one doctor, becomes thereby *probable*, as it is not to be ſuppoſed that a learned divine would adopt an opinion, or recommend a practice, in favour of which no conſiderable reaſon could be alleged.—But here lies the poiſon: this *probable* opinion or practice *may* be followed, ſay the Jeſuits, even when the contrary is ſtill *more probable*, nay, when it is *ſure*, becauſe, though the man err, he errs under the authority of an eminent doctor. Thus ESCOBAR affirms, that a judge may decide in favour of that ſide of a queſtion that is the leaſt probable, and even againſt his own opinion, if he be ſupported by any tolerable authority. See *Lettres Provinciales*, Letter viii.

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I.

“ That actions *intrinſically evil*, and directly “ *contrary to the divine laws*, may be *innocently* “ performed, by thoſe who have ſo much power “ over their own minds, as to join, even ideally, “ a *good end* to this *wicked action*, or (to ſpeak in “ the ſtile of the Jeſuits) who are capable of *di-* “ *recting their attention aright* [t].

“ That *philoſophical ſin* is of a very light and “ trivial nature, and does not deſerve the pains of “ hell:”—(By *philoſophical ſin* the Jeſuits mean *an action contrary to the dictates of nature and right reaſon*, done by a perſon who is ignorant of the written law of God, or doubtful [u] of its true meaning.)

☞ [t] For example, an eccleſiaſtic who buys a benefice, in order to *direct his intention aright*, muſt, by a powerful act of abſtraction, turn away his thoughts from the crime of *ſimony*, which he is committing, to ſome lawful purpoſe, ſuch as that of acquiring an ample ſubſiſtence, or that of doing good by inſtructing the ignorant. Thus again, a man who runs his neighbour through the body in a duel, on account of a trivial affront, to render his action lawful, has only to turn his thoughts from the principle of vengeance to the more decent principle of honour; and the murder he commits will, by the magic power of Jeſuitical morality, be converted into an innocent action. There is no crime, no enormity, to which this abominable maxim may not be extended. *A famous Jeſuit has declared, that a ſon may wiſh for the death of his father, and even rejoice at it when it arrives, provided that his wiſh does not ariſe from any perſonal hatred, but only from a deſire of the patrimony which this death will procure him.* See GASPARD HURTADO, *De ſub. peccat. diſſ.* 9. quoted by DIANA, p. 5. tr. 14. R. 99. and another has had the effrontery to maintain, that a monk or eccleſiaſtic may lawfully aſſaſſinate a calumniator, who threatens laying ſcandalous crimes to the charge of their community, when there is no other way of hindering him to execute his purpoſe. See the works of Father L'AMY, tom. v. diſp. 36. n. 118.

[u] It would be perhaps more accurate to define the *philoſophical ſin* of the Jeſuits to be *an action contrary to right reaſon, which is done by a perſon who is either abſolutely ignorant of God, or does not think of him during the time this action is committed.*

“That the tranſgreſſions committed by a perſon blinded by the ſeduction of luſt, agitated by the impulſe of tumultuous paſſions, and deſtitute of all ſenſe and impreſſion of religion, however deteſtable and heinous they may be in themſelves, are not imputable to the tranſgreſſor before the tribunal of God; and that ſuch tranſgreſſions may often be as involuntary as the actions of a madman:

“That the perſon who takes an oath, or enters into a contract, may, to elude the force of the one, and the obligation of the other, add to the form of words that expreſs them, certain mental additions and tacit reſervations.”

Theſe, and other enormities of a like nature [*w*], are ſaid to make an eſſential part of the ſyſtem of morality inculcated by the Jeſuits. And they were complained of, in the ſtrongeſt remonſtrances,

---

[*w*] The books that have been written to expoſe and refute the corrupt and enormous maxims of the Jeſuits, would make an ample library, were they collected together. But nothing of this kind is equal to the learned, ingenious and humorous work of the famous PASCAL, entitled, *Le Provinciales, ou Lettres ecrites par* LOUIS DE MONTALTE *à un Provincial de ſes amis et aux Jeſuites ſur la Morale et la Politique de ces Pères.* This exquiſite production is accompanied, in ſome editions of it, with the learned and judicious obſervations of NICOLE, who, under the fictitious name of GUILLAUME WENDEROCK, has fully demonſtrated the truth of thoſe facts which PASCAL had advanced, without quoting his authorities, and has placed in a full and ſtriking light, ſeveral intereſting circumſtances which that great man had treated with, perhaps, too much brevity. Theſe *Letters*, which did the Jeſuits more real miſchief than either the indignation of ſovereign princes, or any other calamity that had heretofore fallen upon their Order, were tranſlated into Latin by RACHELIUS. On the other hand, the ſons of LOYOLA, ſenſibly affected and alarmed by this formidable attack upon their reputation, left no means unemployed to defend themſelves againſt ſuch a reſpectable adverſary. They ſent forth their ableſt champions to defend their cauſe, or at leaſt to cover them from ſhame; among which champions the ſubtle and eloquent Father DANIEL, the celebrated author of the Hiſtory of *France*, ſhone forth with a ſuperior luſtre; and, as if they thought it unſafe to truſt to the powers of argument and the force of evidence alone, they applied

---

themſelves for help to the ſecular arm, and had credit enough to obtain a ſentence againſt the *Provinciales*, by which they were condemned to be burnt publicly at *Paris*. See DANIEL's *Opuſcules*, vol. i. p. 363. This author, however, acknowledges, that the greateſt part of the anſwers which the Jeſuits oppoſed to the performance of PASCAL were weak and unſatiſfactory. Certain it is, that (whether it was owing to the ſtrength of argument, or to the elegant wit and humour that reigned in them) the *Provincial Letters* loſt not the ſmalleſt portion of their credit and reputation by all the anſwers that were made to them, but continued to paſs through a variety of editions, which could ſcarcely be printed off with rapidity ſufficient to ſatiſfy the deſires of the public.

Another ſevere attack was made upon the Jeſuits, in a book inferior to PASCAL's in point of wit and genteel pleaſantry, but ſuperior to it in point of evidence, ſince it abounds with paſſages and teſtimonies, which are drawn from the moſt applauded writings of the Jeſuits, and demonſtrate fully the corruption and enormity of the moral rules and maxims inculcated by that famous Order. This book, which was publiſhed at *Mons*, in three volumes 8vo, in the year 1702, bears the following title: *La Morale des Jeſuites, extraite fidélement de leurs Livres, imprimée avec la permiſſion et l'approbation des ſuperieurs de leur Compagnie, par un Docteur de Sorbonne.* The author was PERRAULT (ſon of CHARLES PERRAULT, who began the famous controverſy in *France* concerning the reſpective merit of the ancients and moderns), and his book met with the ſame fate with the *Provincials* of PASCAL; for it was burnt at *Paris* in the year 1670, at the requeſt of the Jeſuits. See the *Opuſcules du* P. DANIEL, tom. i. p. 356. Nor indeed is it at all ſurpriſing, that the Jeſuits exerted all their zeal againſt this compilation, which exhibited, in one ſhocking point of view, all that had been complained of and cenſured in their maxims and inſtitutions, and unfolded the whole myſtery of their iniquity.

It has been alſo laid to the charge of the Jeſuits, that they reduced their pernicious maxims to practice, eſpecially in the remoter parts of the world. This the famous ARNAULD, together with ſome of his Janſeniſt brethren, have undertaken to prove, in that laborious and celebrated work, entitled, *La Morale Pratique des Jeſuites.* In this important work, which conſiſts of eight volumes in 8vo, and of which a ſecond edition was publiſhed at *Amſterdam* in the year 1742, there is a multitude of authentic relations, documents, facts, and teſtimonies, employed to demonſtrate the criminal conduct and remonſtrances, not only by the Dominicans and Janſeniſts, but alſo by the moſt eminent theological doctors of *Paris*, *Poitiers*, *Louvain*, and other academical cities, who expreſſed their abhorrence of them in ſuch a public and ſolemn manner, that the Roman pontif neither thought it ſafe nor honourable to keep ſilence on that head. Accordingly a part of theſe moral maxims were condemned, in the year 1659, by pope ALEXANDER VII., in a public edict; and, in the year 1690, the article relating to *philoſophical ſin* met with the ſame fate, under the pontificate of ALEXANDER VIII. [x]. It was but natural to think, that, if the Order of Jeſuits did not expire under the terrible blows it received from ſuch a formidable liſt of adverſaries, yet their ſyſtem of morals muſt at leaſt have been ſupreſſed and their peſtilential maxims baniſhed from the ſchools. This is the leaſt that could have been expected from the complaints and remonſtrances of the clerical and monaſtic Orders, and the damnatory bulls of the Roman pontifs. And yet, if we may credit the teſtimonies of

---

practices of the Jeſuits. For an ample account of the jeſuitical doctrine concerning *Philoſophical Sin*, and the diſſentions and controverſies it occaſioned, ſee JACOBI HYACINTHI SERRY * *Addenda ad Hiſtor. Congregationum de Auxiliis*, p. 82; as alſo his *Auctarium*, p. 289.

[x] There is a conciſe and accurate account of the conteſts and diviſions, to which the morality of the Jeſuits gave riſe in *France* and in other places, in a work, entitled, *Catechiſme Hiſtorique et Dogmatique ſur les Conteſtations qui diviſent maintenant l'Egliſe*, publiſhed in the year 1730, ſee tom. ii. p. 26.—It is very remarkable, that the two papal bulls of ALEXANDER VII. and VIII., againſt the Jeſuits, are not to be found in the *Bullarium Pontificum*; but the Janſeniſts and Dominicans, who are careful in perpetuating whatever may tend to the diſhonour of the Jeſuits, have preſerved them induſtriouſly from oblivion.

☞ * This is a fictitious name; the true name of the author of the *Addenda* is AUGUSTIN LE BLANC.

many learned and pious men in the communion of *Rome*, even this effect was not produced; and the remonſtrances of the monks, the complaints of the clergy, and the bulls of the popes, rather ſerved to reſtrain, in a certain meaſure, the enormous licentiouſneſs, that had reigned among the writers of this corrupt Order, than to purify the ſeminaries of inſtruction from the contagion of their diſſolute maxims.—After what has been obſerved in relation to the moral ſyſtem of the Jeſuits, it will not be difficult to aſſign a reaſon for the remarkable propenſity that is diſcovered by kings, princes, the nobility, and gentry of both ſexes, and an innumerable multitude of perſons of all ranks and conditions, to commit their conſciences to the direction, and their ſouls to the care, of the brethren of this ſociety. It is, no doubt, highly convenient for perſons, who do not pretend to a rigid obſervance of the duties of religion and morality, to have ſpiritual guides, who diminiſh the guilt of tranſgreſſion, diſguiſe the deformity of vice, let looſe the reins to all the paſſions, nay, even nouriſh them by their diſſolute precepts, and render the way to heaven as eaſy, as agreeable, and ſmooth as is poſſible [y].

What has here been ſaid concerning the erroneous maxims and corrupt practices of the Jeſuits muſt, however, be underſtood with certain modifications and reſtrictions. It muſt not be imagined, that theſe maxims are adopted, or theſe practices juſtified, by all the ſons of LOYOLA, without exception, or that they are publicly taught and inculcated in all their ſchools and ſeminaries; for this, in reality, is not the caſe. As this Order has produced men of learning and genius, ſo neither has it been deſtitute of men of probity and candour; nor would it be a difficult

---

☞ [y] The tranſlator has here inſerted into the text the note [q] of the original.

taſk to compile from the writings of the Jeſuits a much more juſt and proper repreſentation of the duties of religion and the obligations of morality, than that hideous and unſeemly exhibition of both, which PASCAL and his followers have drawn from the jeſuitical *Caſuiſts*, *Summiſts*, and *Moraliſts*. Thoſe who cenſure the Jeſuits in general, muſt, if their cenſures be well founded, have the following circumſtances in view: *Firſt*, That the rulers of that ſociety not only ſuffer ſeveral of their members to propagate publicly impious opinions and corrupt maxims, but even go ſo far as to ſet the ſeal of their approbation to the books in which theſe opinions and maxims are contained [z]: *Secondly*, That the ſyſtem of religion and morality that is taught in the greateſt part of their ſeminaries is ſo looſe, vague, and ill-digeſted, that it not only may be eaſily *perverted* to bad purpoſes and erroneous concluſions, but even ſeems peculiarly *ſuſceptible* of ſuch abuſe: and laſtly, that the ſelect few, who are initiated into the *grand myſteries* of the ſociety, and ſet apart to tranſact its affairs, to carry on its projects, to exert their political talents in the cloſet of the miniſter, or in the cabinet of the prince, commonly make uſe of the dangerous and pernicious maxims that are complained of, to augment the authority and opulence of their Order. The candor and impartiality that become an hiſtorian oblige us to acknowledge, at the ſame time, that, in demonſtrating the turpitude and enormity of certain maxims and opinions of the Jeſuits, their adverſaries have gone too far, and permitted their eloquence and zeal to run into exaggeration. This

---

☞ [z] This is no doubt true. The Jeſuits, as has been obſerved above, note [s], have doctors of all ſorts and ſizes; and this, indeed, is neceſſary, in order to the eſtabliſhment of that univerſal empire at which they aim. See *Lettres Provinciales*, let. v. p. 62. *dixième edit. de Cologne*, 1689.

we might ſhew, with the fulleſt evidence, by examples deduced from the doctrines of *probability* and *mental reſervation*, and the imputations that have been made to the Jeſuits on theſe heads; but this would lead us too far from the thread of our hiſtory. We ſhall only obſerve, that what happens frequently in every kind of controverſy, happened here in a ſingular manner; I mean, that the Jeſuits were charged with tenets, which had been drawn *conſequentially* from their doctrine, by their accuſers, without their conſent;—that their phraſes and terms were not always interpreted according to the preciſe meaning they annexed to them;—and that the tendency of their ſyſtem was repreſented in too partial and unequitable a light.

The ſtate of Exegetic theology, or the progreſs made in the interpretation and expoſition of ſcripture.

XXXVI. The Holy Scriptures did not acquire any new degrees of public reſpect and authority under the pontifs of this century. It can be proved, on the contrary, by the moſt authentic records, that the votaries of *Rome*, and more eſpecially the Jeſuits, employed all their dexterity and art, either to prevent the word of God from falling into the hands of the people, or at leaſt to have it explained in a manner conſiſtent with the intereſt, grandeur, and pretenſions of the church. In *France* and in the *Low Countries* there aroſe, indeed, ſeveral commentators and critics, who were very far from being deſtitute of knowledge and erudition; but it may nevertheleſs be ſaid concerning them, that, inſtead of illuſtrating and explaining the divine oracles, they rendered them more obſcure, by blending their own crude inventions with the dictates of celeſtial wiſdom. This is chargeable even upon the Janſeniſts, who, though ſuperior to the other Roman-catholic expoſitors in moſt reſpects, yet fell into that abſurd method of disfiguring the pure word of God, by far-fetched alluſions, myſtic interpretations,

pretations, and frigid allegories, compiled from the reveries of the ancient fathers [a]. Here, nevertheleſs, an exception is to be made in favour of PASQUIER QUENEL, a prieſt of the oratory, whoſe edition of the *New Teſtament*, accompanied with pious meditations and remarks, made ſuch a prodigious noiſe in the theological world [b], and even in our time has continued to furniſh matter of warm and violent conteſt, and to ſplit the Roman catholic doctors into parties and factions [c].

Of Didactic, Moral, and Polemic Theology.

XXXVII. The greateſt part of the public ſchools retained that dry, intricate, and captious method of teaching theology, that had prevailed in the ages of barbariſm and darkneſs, and was adapted to diſguſt all ſuch as were endowed with a liberal turn of mind. There was no poſſibility of ordering matters ſo, as that *Didactic* or *Biblical theology*, which is ſuppoſed to arrange and illuſtrate the truths of religion by the dictates of Holy Scripture, ſhould be placed upon the ſame footing, and held in the ſame honour, with *ſcholaſtic divinity*, which had its ſource in the metaphyſical viſions of the peripatetic philoſophy. Even the edicts of the pontifs were inſufficient to bring this about. In the greateſt part of the univerſities, the *ſcholaſtic* doctors domineered, and were conſtantly moleſting and inſulting the *Biblical* divines, who, generally ſpeaking, were little ſkilled in the captious arts of ſophiſtry and dialectical chicane. It is nevertheleſs to be obſerved, that many of the French doctors, and more eſpecially the Janſeniſts, explained the principal doctrines and duties of Chriſtianity in a ſtyle and manner that were at leaſt recommendable on account of their elegance and perſpicuity; and indeed it may be affirmed, that almoſt all the theological or moral treatiſes of this age, that were compoſed with any tolerable degree of ſimplicity and good ſenſe, had the doctors of *Port-Royal* or the French prieſts of the oratory, for their authors. We have already taken notice of the changes that were introduced, during this century, into the method of carrying on theological controverſy. The German, Belgic, and French divines, being at length convinced, by a diſagreeable experience, that their captious, incoherent, and uncharitable manner of diſputing, exaſperated thoſe who differed from them in their religious ſentiments, and confirmed them in their reſpective ſyſtems, inſtead of converting them; and perceiving, moreover, that the arguments in which they had formerly placed their principal confidence, proved feeble and inſufficient to make the leaſt impreſſion, found it neceſſary to look out for new and more ſpecious methods of attack and defence.

---

[a] The reader will find a ſtriking example of this in the well-known *Bible* of ISAAC LE MAITRE, commonly called SACY, which contains all the crude and extravagant fancies and allegories, with which the ancient doctors obſcured the beautiful ſimplicity of the Holy Scriptures, and rendered their cleareſt expreſſions intricate and myſterious.

☞ [b] That is, in the Roman-catholic part of the theological world. Never perhaps did any thing ſhew, in a more ſtriking manner, the blind zeal of faction than the hard treatment this book met with. RENAUDOT, a very learned French abbot, who reſided ſome time at *Rome* during the pontificate of CLEMENT XI., went one day to viſit that pontif, who was a patron of learned men, and found him reading QUENEL's Bible. On the abbot's entering the chamber, the pope accoſted him thus: *Here is an admirable book! We have nobody at* Rome *capable of writing in this manner. I would be glad if I could engage the author of it to reſide here.*—The very ſame pope that pronounced this encomium on QUENEL's book, condemned it publicly afterwards, and employed all his authority to ſuppreſs it. See VOLTAIRE, *Siécle de* LOUIS XIV., vol. ii. p. 293. *Edit. de Dreſde*, 1753.

[c] The firſt part of this work, which contains *Obſervations* on the four Goſpels, was publiſhed in the year 1671; and as it was received with univerſal applauſe, this encouraged the author, not only to reviſe and augment it, but alſo to enlarge his plan, and compoſe *Obſervations* on the other books of the New Teſtament. See *Catéchiſme Hiſtorique ſur les Conteſtations de l'Egliſe*, tom. ii. p. 150.—CH. EBERH. WEISMANNI *Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* Sæc. xvii. p. 588.

The conteſts that aroſe under the pontificate of Clement VIII. between the Jeſuits and Dominicans concerning the Divine Grace.

XXXVIII. The Romiſh church has, notwithſtanding its boaſted uniformity of doctrine, been always divided by a multitude of controverſies. It would be endleſs to enumerate the diſputes that have ariſen between the ſeminaries of learning, and the conteſts that have divided the monaſtic Orders. The greateſt part of theſe, as being of little moment, we ſhall paſs over in ſilence; for they have been treated with indifference and neglect by the popes, who never took notice of them but when they grew violent and noiſy, and then ſuppreſſed them with an imperious nod, that impoſed ſilence upon the contending parties. Beſides, theſe leſs momentous controverſies, which it will never be impoſſible entirely to extinguiſh, are not of ſuch a nature as to affect the church in its fundamental principles, to endanger its conſtitution, or to hurt its intereſts. It will, therefore, be ſufficient to give a brief account of thoſe debates, that, by their ſuperior importance and their various connections and dependencies, may be ſaid to have affected the church in general, and to have threatened it with alarming changes and revolutions.

And here the firſt place is naturally due to thoſe famous debates that were carried on between the *Jeſuits* and *Dominicans*, concerning *the nature and neceſſity of Divine Grace*; the deciſion of which important point had, towards the concluſion of the preceding century, been committed by CLEMENT VIII. to a ſelect aſſembly of learned divines. Theſe arbiters, after having employed ſeveral years in deliberating upon this nice and critical ſubject, and in examining the arguments of the contending parties, intimated, plainly enough, to the pontif, that the ſentiments of the Dominicans,

nicans, concerning *Grace*, *Predeſtination*, *Human Liberty*, and *Original Sin*, were more conformable to the doctrine of ſcripture and the deciſions of the ancient fathers than the opinions of MOLINA, which were patroniſed by the Jeſuits. They obſerved, more eſpecially, that the former leaned towards the tenets of AUGUSTINE; while the latter bore a ſtriking reſemblance of the Pelagian hereſy. In conſequence of this declaration, CLEMENT ſeemed reſolved to paſs condemnation on the Jeſuits, and to determine the controverſy in favour of the Dominicans. Things were in this ſtate in the year 1601, when the Jeſuits, alarmed at the dangers that threatened them, beſet the old pontif night and day, and ſo importuned him with entreaties, menaces, arguments, and complaints, that, in the year 1602, he conſented to re-examine this intricate controverſy, and undertook himſelf the critical taſk of principal arbitrator therein. For this purpoſe, he choſe a council [d] (compoſed of fifteen cardinals, nine profeſſors of divinity, and five biſhops), which, during the ſpace of three years [e], aſſembled ſeventy-eight times, or, to ſpeak in the ſtyle of *Rome*, held ſo many *congregations*. At theſe meetings, the pontif heard, at one time, the Jeſuits and Dominicans diſputing in favour of their reſpective ſyſtems; and ordered, at another, the aſſembled doctors to weigh their reaſons, and examine the proofs that were offered on both ſides of this difficult queſtion. The reſult of this examination is not known with any degree of certainty; ſince the death of CLEMENT, which happened on the fourth day of March, in the year 1605, prevented his pronouncing a deciſive ſentence. The Do-

---

☞ [d] This council was called the Congregation *de Auxiliis*.

[e] From the 20th of March 1602, to the 22d of January 1605.

minicans aſſure us, that the pope, had he lived, would have condemned Molina. The Jeſuits, on the contrary, maintain, that he would have acquitted him publicly from all charge of hereſy and error. They alone, who have ſeen the records of this council, and the journal of its proceedings, are qualified to determine which of the two we are to believe; but theſe records are kept with the utmoſt ſecrecy at *Rome*.

Continuation of this controverſy under Paul V. and its iſſue.

XXXIX. The proceedings of the *congregation* that had been aſſembled by Clement were ſuſpended, for ſome time, by the death of that pontif; but they were reſumed, in the year 1605, by the order of Paul V., his ſucceſſor. Their deliberations, which were continued from the month of *September*, till the month of *March* in the following year, did not turn ſo much upon the merits of the cauſe, which were already ſufficiently examined, as upon the prudent and proper method of finiſhing the conteſt. The great queſtion now was, whether the well-being of the church would admit of the deciſion of this controverſy by a papal bull? and, if ſuch a deciſion was found adviſeable, it ſtill remained to be conſidered, in what terms the bull ſhould be drawn up. All theſe long and ſolemn deliberations reſembled the delivery of the mountain in the fable, and ended in this reſolution, that the whole controverſy, inſtead of being *decided*, ſhould be *ſuppreſſed*; and that each of the contending parties ſhould have the liberty of following their reſpective opinions. The Dominicans aſſert, that the two pontifs, together with the *congregation* of divines that they employed in the review of this important controverſy, were entirely perſuaded of the juſtice of *their* cauſe, and of the truth of *their* ſyſtem; they moreover obſerve, that Paul V. had expreſsly ordered a ſolemn condemnation of the doctrine of the Jeſuits to be drawn up; but was prevented from finiſhing and publiſhing it to the world, by the unhappy war that was kindled about that time between him and the Venetians. The Jeſuits, on the other hand, repreſent theſe accounts of the Dominicans as entirely fictitious, and affirm that neither the pontif, nor the more judicious and reſpectable members of the *congregation*, found any thing in the ſentiments of MOLINA that was worthy of cenſure, or ſtood in much need of correction. In a point which is rendered thus uncertain by contradictory teſtimonies and aſſertions, it is difficult to determine what we are to believe; it however appears extremely probable, that, whatever the private opinion of PAUL V. may have been, he was prevented from pronouncing a public determination of this famous controverſy, by his apprehenſions of offending either the king of *France*, who protected the Jeſuits, or the king of *Spain*, who warmly maintained the cauſe of the Dominicans. It is farther probable, nay almoſt certain, that, had the pontif been independent on all foreign influence, and at full liberty to decide this knotty point, he would have pronounced one of thoſe *ambiguous* ſentences, for which the oracle of *Rome* is ſo famous, and would have ſo conducted matters as to ſhock neither of the contending parties [*f*].

XL. The

[*f*] Beſides the authors we have above recommended as proper to be conſulted in relation to theſe conteſts, ſee LE CLERC, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire des controverſes dans l'Egliſe Romaine ſur la Predeſtination et ſur la Grace*, in his *Bibliotheque Univerſelle et Hiſtorique*, tom. xiv. p. 235.—The conduct, both of the Jeſuits and Dominicans, after their controverſy was huſhed in ſilence, affords much reaſon to preſume, that they had been both ſecretly exhorted by the Roman pontif to mitigate ſomewhat their reſpective ſyſtems, and ſo to modify their doctrines or expreſſions, as to avoid the reproaches of hereſy that had been caſt upon them; for the Jeſuits had been accuſed of Pelagianiſm, and the Dominicans of a propenſity to the tenets of the Proteſtant churches. This

appears,

The riſe of Janſeniſm, and the conteſts it produced.

XL. The flame of controverſy, which ſeemed thus extinguiſhed, or at leaſt covered, broke out again

---

appears, in a more particular manner, from a letter written by CLAUDIUS AQUAVIVA, general of the Jeſuits, in the year 1613, and addreſſed to all the members of his Order. In this letter the prudent general modifies with great dexterity and caution the ſentiments of MOLINA, and enjoins it upon the brethren of the ſociety to teach every where the doctrine which repreſents the Supreme Being, *as electing, freely, to eternal life, without any regard had to their merits, thoſe whom he has been pleaſed to render partakers of that ineſtimable bleſſing*; but, at the ſame time, he exhorts them to inculcate this doctrine in ſuch a manner, as not to give up the tenets, relating to Divine Grace, which they had maintained in their controverſy with the Dominicans. Never, ſurely, was ſuch a contradictory exhortation or order heard of; the good general thought, nevertheleſs, that he could reconcile abundantly theſe contradictions, by that branch of the divine knowledge which is called, by the ſchoolmen, *ſcientia media*. See the *Catéchiſme Hiſtorique ſur les diſſentions de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 207.

On the other hand, the Dominicans, although their ſentiments remain the ſame that they were before the commencement of this controverſy, have learned, notwithſtanding, to caſt a kind of ambiguity and obſcurity over their theological ſyſtem, by uſing certain terms and expreſſions, that are manifeſtly borrowed from the ſchools of the Jeſuits; and this they do to prevent the latter from reproaching them with a propenſity to the doctrine of CALVIN. They are, moreover, much leſs remarkable, than formerly, for their zealous oppoſition to the Jeſuits, which may be owing, perhaps, to prudent reflections on the dangers they have been involved in by this oppoſition, and the fruitleſs pains and labour it has coſt them. The *Janſeniſts* reproach them ſeverely with this change of conduct, and conſider it as a manifeſt and notorious apoſtaſy from divine truth. See the *Lettres Provinciales* of PASCAL, lettr. ii. p. 27. *Edit. de Cologne*, &c. 1689.—We are not, however, to conclude, from this change of ſtyle and external conduct among the Dominicans, that they are reconciled to the Jeſuits, and that there remain no traces of their ancient oppoſition to that perfidious Order. By no means; for beſides that, many of them are ſhocked at the exceſſive timidity and prudence of a great part of their brethren, the whole body retains ſtill ſome hidden ſparks of the indignation with which they formerly beheld the Jeſuits; and, when a convenient occaſion of diſcovering this indignation is offered, they do not let it paſs unimproved. The *Janſeniſts* are here embarked in the ſame cauſe with the Dominicans;

again with new violence, in the year 1640, and formed a kind of ſchiſm in the church of *Rome*, which involved it in great perplexity, and proved highly detrimental to it in various reſpects. The occaſion of theſe new troubles was the publication of a book, intitled, AUGUSTINUS, compoſed by CORNELIUS JANSENIUS, biſhop of *Ypres*, and publiſhed after the death of the author [g]. In this book, which even the Jeſuits acknowledge to be the production of a man of learning and piety, the doctrine of AUGUSTINE, concerning man's *natural corruption*, and the *nature* and *efficacy* of that *Divine Grace*, which alone can efface this unhappy ſtain, is unfolded at large, and illuſtrated, for the moſt part, in AUGUSTINE's own words. For the end, which JANSENIUS propoſed to himſelf in this work,

---

Dominicans; ſince the ſentiments of St. THOMAS, concerning *Divine Grace*, differ but very little from thoſe of St. AUGUSTINE. Cardinal HENRY NORIS, the moſt eminently learned among the followers of the latter, expreſſes his concern, that he is not at liberty to publiſh what paſſed in favour of AUGUSTINE, and to the diſadvantage of MOLINA and the Jeſuits, in the famous Congregation *de Auxiliis*, ſo often aſſembled by the Popes CLEMENT VIII. and PAUL V.; ſee his *Vindiciæ Auguſtinianæ*, cap. vi. p. 1175. tom. i. opp.—*Quando*, ſays he, *recentiori Romano decreto id vetitum eſt, cum diſpendio cauſæ, quam defendo, neceſſariam defenſionem omitto.*

[g] For an account of this famous man, ſee BAYLE's *Dictionary*, tom. ii. at the article JANSENIUS.—LEYDECKER, *De vita et morte* JANSENII, lib. iii. which makes the firſt part of his *Hiſtory of Janſeniſm*, publiſhed at *Utrecht* in 8vo in the year 1695.—*Dictionaire des Livres Janſéniſtes*, tom. i. p. 120.—This celebrated work of JANSENIUS, which gave ſuch a wound to the Romiſh church, as neither the power nor wiſdom of its pontifs will ever be able to heal, is divided into three parts. The *firſt* is hiſtorical, and contains a relation of the Pelagian controverſy, which aroſe in the fifth century. In the *ſecond*, we find an accurate account and illuſtration of the doctrine of AUGUSTINE, relating to the *Conſtitution and powers of the Human Nature, in its original, fallen, and renewed ſtate.* The *third* contains the doctrine of the ſame great man, relating to the *Aids of ſanctifying Grace procured by Chriſt, and to the eternal Predeſtination of men and angels.* The ſtyle of JANSENIUS is clear, but not ſufficiently correct.

work, was not to give his own private ſentiments concerning theſe important points, but to ſhew in what manner they had been underſtood and explained by that celebrated father of the church, now mentioned, whoſe name and *authority* were univerſally revered in all parts of the Roman-catholic world [*h*]. No incident could be more unfavourable to the cauſe of the Jeſuits, and the progreſs of their religious ſyſtem, than the publication of this book; for as the doctrine of AUGUSTINE differed but very little from that of the Dominicans [*i*]; as it was held ſacred, nay almoſt reſpected as divine, in the church of *Rome*, on account of the extraordinary merit and authority of that illuſtrious biſhop, and, at the ſame time, was almoſt diametrically oppoſite to the ſentiments generally received among the Jeſuits; theſe latter could ſcarcely conſider the book of JANSENIUS in any other light than as a tacit, but formidable, refutation of their opinions concerning *Human Liberty* and *Divine Grace*. And, accordingly, they not only drew their pens againſt this famous book, but alſo uſed their moſt zealous endeavours to obtain a public condemnation of it from *Rome*. Their endeavours were not unſucceſsful. The Roman inquiſitors began the oppoſition by prohibiting the peruſal of it, in the year 1641; and the year following, URBAN VIII. condemned it by a ſolemn bull, as infected with ſeveral errors, that had been long baniſhed from the church.

[*h*] Thus JANSENIUS expreſſes himſelf in his *Auguſtinus*, tom. ii. *Lib. Proœmial.* cap. xxix. p. 65.—*Non ego hic de aliqua nova ſententia reperienda diſputo . . . ſed de antiqua Auguſtini.—Quæritur, non quid de naturæ humanæ ſtatibus et viribus, vel de Dei gratia et predeſtinatione ſentiendum eſt, ſed quid Auguſtinus olim eccleſiæ nomine et applauſu tradiderit, prædicaverit, ſcriptoque multipliciter conſignaverit.*

[*i*] The Dominicans followed the ſentiments of THOMAS AQUINAS, concerning the nature and efficacy of Divine Grace.

XLI. There were nevertheleſs places, even within the bounds of the Romiſh church, where neither the deciſions of the inquiſitor, nor the bull of the pontif, were in the leaſt reſpected. The doctors of *Louvain* in particular, and the followers of AUGUSTINE in general, who were very numerous in the *Netherlands*, oppoſed, with the utmoſt vigour, the proceedings of the Jeſuits, and the condemnation of JANSENIUS; and hence aroſe a warm conteſt, which proved a ſource of much trouble to the Belgic provinces. But it was not confined within ſuch narrow limits; it reached the neighbouring countries, and broke out, with peculiar vehemence, in *France*, where the abbot of *St. Cyran* [*k*], a man of an elegant genius, and equally diſtinguiſhed by the extent of his learning, the luſtre of his piety, and the ſanctity of his manners, had procured AUGUSTINE many zealous followers, and the Jeſuits as many bitter and implacable adverſaries [*l*]. This reſpectable

abbot

[*k*] The name of this abbot was JEAN DU VERGER DE HAURANE.

[*l*] This illuſtrious abbot is conſidered by the Janſeniſts as equal in merit and authority to JANSENIUS himſelf, whom he is ſuppoſed to have aſſiſted in compoſing his *Auguſtinus*. The French, more eſpecially (I mean ſuch of them as adopt the doctrine of AUGUSTINE), revere him as an oracle, and even extol him beyond JANSENIUS. For an account of the life and tranſactions of this pious abbot, ſee LANCELOT's *Memoires touchant la vie de M. de S. Cyran*, which were publiſhed at *Cologn* *, in the year 1738, in two volumes 8vo.—Add to theſe *Recueil de pluſieurs pièces pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de Port-Royal*, p. 1,—150.—ARNAUD D'ANDILLY, *Memoires au ſujet de l'Abbé de S. Cyran*, which are publiſhed in the firſt volume of his *Vies des Religieuſes de Port-Royal*, p. 15—44.—BAYLE's *Dictionary*, vol. ii. at the article JANSENIUS,—*Dictionaire des*

* Though they are ſaid, in the title-page, to have been printed at *Cologn*; yet it is preſumed, on good grounds, that they firſt ſaw the light at *Utrecht*.

Livres

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I.

abbot was the intimate friend and relation of JANSENIUS, and one of the moſt ſtrenuous defenders of his doctrine. On the other hand, the far greateſt part of the French theologiſts appeared on the ſide of the Jeſuits, whoſe religious tenets ſeemed more honourable to human nature, or at leaſt more agreeable to its propenſities, more ſuitable to the genius of the Romiſh religion, and more adapted to promote and advance the intereſts of the Romiſh church, than the doctrine of AUGUSTIN. The party of JANSENIUS had alſo its patrons; and they were ſuch as reflected honour on the cauſe. In this reſpectable liſt we may reckon ſeveral biſhops eminent for their piety, and ſome of the firſt and moſt elegant geniuſes of the French nation, ſuch as ARNAUD, NICOLE, PASCAL, and QUENEL, and the other famous and learned men, who are known under the denomination of the *Authors of Port-Royal*. This party was alſo conſiderably augmented by a multitude of perſons, who looked upon the uſual practice of piety in the Romiſh church (which conſiſts in the frequent uſe of the Sacraments, the confeſſion of ſins, and the performance of certain external acts of religion) as much inferior to what the Goſpel of CHRIST requires, and who conſidered Chriſtian piety as the vital and internal principle of a ſoul, in which true faith and divine love have gained a happy aſcendant. Thus one of the contending parties excelled in the number and power of its votaries; the other in the learning, genius, and piety of its adherents; and, things being thus balanced, it is not difficult to comprehend, how a controverſy, which began about a century ago,

---

Livres Janſéniſtes, tom. i. p. 133.—For an account of the earlier ſtudies of the abbot in queſtion, ſee GABRIEL LIRON, *Singularités Hiſtoriques et Litteraires*, tom. iv. p. 507.

ſhould be ſtill carried on with the moſt vehement contention and ardour [*m*].

The methods and arguments employed by both parties in this controverſy.

XLII. Thoſe who have taken an attentive view of this long, and indeed endleſs controverſy, cannot but think it a matter both of curioſity and amuſement to obſerve the contrivances, ſtratagems, arguments, and arts employed by both *Jeſuits* and *Janſeniſts*; by the former in their methods of attack, and by the latter in their plans of defence. The *Jeſuits* came forth into the field of controverſy, armed with ſophiſtical arguments, odious compariſons, papal bulls, royal edicts, and the protection of a great part of the nobility and biſhops; and, as if all this had appeared to them inſufficient, they had recourſe to ſtill more formidable auxiliaries, even the ſecular arm, and a competent number of dragoons. The *Janſeniſts*, far from being diſmayed at the view of this warlike hoſt, ſtood their ground with ſteadineſs and intrepidity. They evaded the mortal blows that were levelled at them in the royal and papal mandates, by the help of nice interpretations, ſubtile diſtinctions, nay, by the very ſame ſophiſtical refinements which they blamed in the Jeſuits. To the threatenings and frowns of the nobles and biſhops, who protected their adverſaries, they oppoſed the favour and applauſe of the people; to ſophiſms they oppoſed ſophiſms, and invectives to invectives; and to human power they oppoſed the Divine Omnipotence, and boaſted of the miracles by which heaven had declared itſelf in their favour. When they perceived that the ſtrongeſt arguments and the moſt reſpectable authorities were inſufficient to conquer the obſtinacy of their adverſaries, they endeavoured, by their religious exploits, and their application to the advancement of piety and learning, to obtain the favour of the pontifs, and ſtrengthen their intereſt with the people. Hence they declared war againſt the enemies of the Romiſh church; formed new ſtratagems to enſnare and ruin the Proteſtants; took extraordinary pains in inſtructing the youth in all the liberal arts and ſciences; drew up a variety of uſeful, accurate, and elegant abridgments, containing the elements of philoſophy and the learned languages; publiſhed a multitude of treatiſes on practical religion and morality, whoſe perſuaſive eloquence charmed all ranks and orders of men; introduced and cultivated an eaſy, correct, and agreeable manner of writing; and gave accurate and learned interpretations of ſeveral ancient authors. To all theſe various kinds of merit, the greateſt part of which were real and ſolid, they added others that were at leaſt viſionary and chimerical; for they endeavoured to perſuade, and did, in effect, perſuade many, that the Supreme Being interpoſed particularly in ſupport of their cauſe, and, by prodigies and miracles of a ſtupendous kind, confirmed the truth of the doctrine of AUGUSTINE; in a manner adapted to remove all doubt, and triumph over all oppoſition [n].

[*m*] The hiſtory of this conteſt is to be found in many authors, who have either given a relation of the whole, or treated apart ſome of its moſt intereſting branches. The writers that ought to be principally conſulted on this ſubject are thoſe which follow: Gerberon, *Hiſtoire Générale du Janſéniſme*, publiſhed in 1700, at *Amſterdam*, in three volumes 8vo, and republiſhed in five volumes 12mo, at *Lyons*, in 1708.—Du Mas, *Hiſtoire des Cinq Propoſitions de* Jansenius, printed at *Liege* in 8vo in 1694. Of theſe two writers, the former maintains the cauſe of the Janſeniſts, while the latter favours that of the Jeſuits.—Add to theſe, Melch. Leydecker's *Hiſtoria Janſeniſmi*, printed at *Utrecht* in 8vo in 1695; and Voltaire's *Siécle de* Louis XIV. tom. ii. p. 264. Several books, written on both ſides, are enumerated in a work publiſhed in 8vo in 1735, under the following title: *Bibliothèque Janſeniſte, ou Catalogue Alphabetique des principaux Livres Janſeniſtes*, the author of which is ſaid to be Domin. Colonia, a learned Jeſuit. This book, as we have had before occaſion to obſerve, has been republiſhed at *Antwerp*, with conſiderable additions, in four volumes 8vo, under the title of, *Dictionaire des Livres Janſeniſtes*.—See *Recueil des pieces pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de Port-Royal*, p. 325.

---

[n] It is well known that the *Janſeniſts*, or *Auguſtinians*, have long pretended to confirm their doctrine by miracles; and they even acknowledge, that theſe miracles have ſometimes ſaved them, when their affairs have been reduced to a deſperate ſituation. See *Memoires de Port Royal*, tom. i. p. 256. tom. ii. p. 107.—The firſt time we hear mention made of theſe miracles is in 1656, and the following years, when a *pretended* thorn of that deriſive crown that was put upon our SAVIOUR's head by the Roman ſoldiers, is reported to have performed ſeveral marvellous cures in the convent of *Port-Royal*. See the *Recueil de pluſieurs pieces pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de Port-Royal*, p. 228. 448.—FONTAINE, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de Port-Royal*, tom. ii. p. 131.—Theſe were followed by other prodigies in the year 1661.—*Vies des Religieuſes de Port-Royal*, tom. i. p. 192. and in the year 1664, *Memoires de Port-Royal*, tom. iii. p. 252.—The fame of theſe miracles was very great during the laſt century, and proved ſingularly advantageous to the cauſe of the Janſeniſts; but they are now fallen, even in *France*, into oblivion and diſcredit. The *Janſeniſts*, therefore, of the preſent age, being preſſed by their adverſaries, were obliged to have recourſe to new prodigies, as the credit of the old ones was entirely worn out; and they ſeemed, indeed, to have had miracles at command, by the conſiderable number they pretended to perform. Thus (if we are credulous enough to believe their reports) in the year 1725, a woman, whoſe name was LE FOSSE, was *ſuddenly* cured of a bloody flux, by imploring the aid of the *Hoſt*, when it was, one day, carried by a *Janſeniſt* prieſt. About two years after this, we are told, that the tomb of GERHARD ROUSSE, a canon of *Avignon*, was honoured with miracles of a ſtupendous kind; and, finally, we are informed, that the ſame honour was conferred, in the year 1731, on the bones of the Abbé DE PARIS, which were interred at *St. Medard*, where innumerable miracles are ſaid to have been wrought. This laſt ſtory has given riſe to the warmeſt conteſts, between the ſuperſtitious or crafty Janſeniſts and their adverſaries in all communions. Beſides all this, QUESNELL, LEVIER, DESANGINS, and TOURNUS, the great ornaments of Janſeniſm, are ſaid to have furniſhed extraordinary ſuccours, on ſeveral occaſions, to ſick and infirm perſons, who teſtified a lively confidence in their prayers and *merits*. See a famous Janſeniſt book compoſed in anſwer to the *Bull Unigenitus*, and entitled, *Jeſus Chriſt ſous l'Anathéme et ſous l'Excommunication*,

All this rendered the Janſeniſts extremely popular, and held the victory of the Jeſuits for ſome time dubious; nay, it is more than probable, that the former would have triumphed, had not the cauſe of the latter been the cauſe of the papacy, and had not the ſtability and grandeur of the Romiſh church depended, in a great meaſure, upon the ſucceſs of their religious maxims.

Five propoſitions of Janſenius condemned by Innocent X.

XLIII. It appears, from ſeveral circumſtances, that URBAN VIII., and, after him, INNOCENT X., were really bent on appeaſing theſe dangerous tumults, in the ſame manner as the popes in former times had prudently ſuppreſſed the controverſies excited by BAIUS and the Dominicans. But the vivacity, inconſtancy, and reſtleſs ſpirit of the French doctors threw all into confuſion, and diſconcerted the meaſures of the pontifs. The

art. xvii. p. 61. xviii. p. 66. *Edit. Utrecht.*—There is no doubt, but a great part of the Janſeniſts defend theſe miracles from principle, and in conſequence of a perſuaſion of their truth and reality; for that party abounds with perſons, whoſe piety is blended with a moſt ſuperſtitious credulity, who look upon their religious ſyſtem as celeſtial truth, and their cauſe as the immediate cauſe of heaven, and who are conſequently diſpoſed to think that it cannot poſſibly be neglected by the Deity, or left without extraordinary marks of his approbation and ſupporting preſence. It is however amazing, nay almoſt incredible, on the other hand, that the more judicious defenders of this cauſe, thoſe eminent Janſeniſts, whoſe ſagacity, learning, and good ſenſe, diſcover themſelves ſo abundantly in other matters, do not conſider that the powers of nature, the efficacy of proper remedies, or the effects of imagination, produce many important changes and effects, which impoſture, or a blind attachment to ſome particular cauſe, lead many to attribute to the miraculous interpoſition of the Deity. We can eaſily account for the deluſions of weak enthuſiaſts, or the tricks of egregious impoſtors; but when we ſee men of piety and judgment appearing in defence of ſuch miracles as thoſe now under conſideration, we muſt conclude, that they look upon fraud as lawful in the ſupport of a good cauſe, and make no ſcruple of deceiving the people, when they propoſe, by this deluſion, to confirm and propagate what they take to be the truth.

oppoſers of the doctrine of AUGUSTINE ſelected *five propoſitions* out of the work of JANSENIUS already mentioned, which appeared to them the moſt erroneous in their nature, and the moſt pernicious in their tendency; and, being ſet on by the inſtigation, and ſeconded by the influence of the Jeſuits, employed their moſt zealous endeavours and their moſt importunate intreaties, at the court of *Rome*, to have theſe propoſitions condemned. On the other hand, a great part of the Gallican clergy uſed their utmoſt efforts to prevent this condemnation; and, for that purpoſe, they ſent deputies to *Rome*, to entreat INNOCENT X. to ſuſpend his final deciſion until the true ſenſe of theſe propoſitions was deliberately examined, ſince the ambiguity of ſtyle, in which they were expreſſed, rendered them ſuſceptible of a falſe interpretation. But theſe entreaties were ineffectual: the intereſt and importunities of the Jeſuits prevailed; and the pontif, without examining the merits of the cauſe with a ſuitable degree of impartiality and attention, condemned, by a public bull, on the 31ſt of May, 1653, the propoſitions of JANSENIUS. Theſe propoſitions contained the following doctrines:

1. That *there are divine precepts, which good men, notwithſtanding their deſire to obſerve them, are, nevertheleſs, abſolutely unable to obey; nor has God given them that meaſure of grace, that is eſſentially neceſſary to render them capable of ſuch obedience:*

2. That *no perſon, in this corrupt ſtate of nature, can reſiſt the influence of divine grace, when it operates upon the mind:*

3. That, *in order to render human actions meritorious, it is not requiſite that they be exempt from* NECESSITY, *but only that they be free from* CONSTRAINT [o].

---

[o] AUGUSTINE, LEIBNITZ, and a conſiderable number of modern philoſophers, who maintain the doctrine of NECESSITY,

4. That *the Semi-pelagians err grievouſly in maintaining, that the human will is endowed with the power of either receiving or reſiſting the aids and influences of preventing grace:*

5. That *whoſoever affirms, that Jeſus Chriſt made expiation, by his ſufferings and death, for the ſins of all mankind, is a Semi-pelagian.*

Of theſe propoſitions the pontif declared the firſt four only *heretical;* but he pronounced the fifth *raſh, impious,* and *injurious* to the Supreme Being [*p*].

Alexander VII. publiſhes a bull againſt Janſenius.

XLIV. This ſentence of the ſupreme eccleſiaſtical judge was indeed painful to the Janſeniſts, and of conſequence highly agreeable to their adverſaries. It did not however either drive the former to deſpair, or ſatisfy the latter to the extent of their deſires; for while the *doctrine* was condemned, the *man* eſcaped. JANSENIUS was not named in the *bull*, nor did the pontif even declare that the *five propoſitions* were maintained in the book entitled AUGUSTINUS, in the ſenſe in which he had condemned them. Hence the diſciples of AUGUSTINE and JANSENIUS defended themſelves by a diſtinction invented by the ingenious and ſubtile ANTHONY ARNAUD, in conſequence of which they conſidered ſeparately in this controverſy the *matter of doctrine* and the *matter of fact;* that is to ſay, they acknowledged themſelves bound to believe, that the *five propoſitions* abovementioned were juſtly condemned by the

---

CESSITY, conſider this neceſſity in *moral actions*, as conſiſtent with true liberty, becauſe it is conſiſtent with *ſpontaneity* and choice. According to them, conſtraint alone and external force deſtroy *merit* and *imputation*.

[*p*] This *Bull* is ſtill extant in the *Bullareum Romanum*, tom. vi. p. 456. It has alſo been publiſhed, together with ſeveral other pieces relating to this controverſy, by DU PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, in his *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 261.

Roman pontif [q]; but they maintained, that the pope had not declared, and conſequently that they were not bound to believe, that theſe propoſitions were to be found in Jansenius's book, in the ſenſe in which they had been condemned [r]. They did not however enjoy long the benefit of this artful diſtinction. The reſtleſs and invincible hatred of their enemies purſued them in every quarter where they looked for protection or repoſe; and at length engaged Alexander VII., the ſucceſſor of Innocent, to declare, by a ſolemn bull, iſſued out in the year 1656, that the *five propoſitions*, that had been condemned, were the tenets of Jansenius, and were contained in his book. The pontif did not ſtop here; but to this flagrant inſtance of imprudence added another ſtill more ſhocking; for, in the year 1665, he ſent into *France* the form of a declaration, that was to be ſubſcribed by all thoſe who aſpired after any preferment in the church, and in which it was affirmed, that the *five propoſitions* were to be found in the book of Jansenius, in the ſame ſenſe in which they had been condemned by the church [s]. This declaration, whoſe unexampled temerity and contentious tendency appeared in the moſt odious colours, not only to the Janſeniſts, but alſo to the wiſer part of the French nation, produced the moſt deplorable diviſions and tumults. It was immediately oppoſed with vigour by the Janſeniſts, who maintained, that in *matters of fact* the pope was *fallible*, eſpecially when his deciſions were merely perſonal, and not confirm-

---

☞ [q] This was what our author calls the *queſtio de jure*.

☞ [r] This is the *queſtio de facto*.

[s] This *Bull*, together with ſeveral other pieces, is alſo publiſhed by Du Plessis D'Argentre, in his *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. 281. 288. 306.—See the form of Alexander's declaration, with the *Mandate* of Lewis XIV. ibid. p. 314.

ed by a general council; and, of conſequence, that it was neither obligatory nor neceſſary to ſubſcribe this papal declaration, which had only a matter of fact for its object. The Jeſuits, on the contrary, audaciouſly aſſerted, even openly, in the city of *Paris*, and in the face of the Gallican church, that faith and confidence in the papal deciſions relating to matter of *fact*, had no leſs the characters of a well-grounded and *divine faith*, than when theſe deciſions related merely to matters of doctrine and opinion. It is to be remarked, on the other hand, that all the Janſeniſts were by no means ſo reſolute and intrepid as thoſe abovementioned. Some of them declared, that they would neither ſubſcribe nor reject the *Form* in queſtion, but ſhew their veneration for the authority of the pope, by obſerving a profound ſilence on that ſubject. Others profeſſed themſelves ready to ſubſcribe it, not indeed without exception and reſerve, but on condition of being allowed to explain, either verbally or in writing, the ſenſe in which they underſtood it, or the diſtinctions and limitations with which they were willing to adopt it. Others employed a variety of methods and ſtratagems to elude the force of this tyrannical *declaration* [t]. But nothing of this kind was ſufficient to ſatisfy the violent demands of the Jeſuits; nothing leſs than the entire ruin of the Janſeniſts could appeaſe their fury. Such, therefore, among the latter, as made the leaſt oppoſition to the declaration in queſtion, were caſt into priſon, or ſent into exile, or involved in ſome other ſpecies of perſecution; and it is well known, that this ſeverity was a conſequence of the ſuggeſtions of the Jeſuits, and of their influence in cabinet-councils.

---

[t] See DU MAS, *Hiſtoire des Cinq Propoſitions*, p. 158.— GERBERON, *Hiſtoire Generale du Janſeniſme*, p. ii. p. 516.

This perſecution is ſuſpended under the pontificate of Clement IX.—This ſuſpenſion commonly called the Peace of Clement.

XLV. The lenity or prudence of Clement IX. ſuſpended, for a while, the calamities of thoſe who had ſacrificed their liberty and their fortunes to their zeal for the doctrine of Augustine, and gave them both time to breathe, and reaſon to hope for better days. This change, which happened in the year 1669, was occaſioned by the fortitude and reſolution of the biſhops of *Angers*, *Beauvais*, *Pamiers*, and *Alet*, who obſtinately and glorioully refuſed to ſubſcribe, without the proper explications and diſtinctions, the oath or declaration that had produced ſuch troubles and diviſions in the church. They did not indeed ſtand alone in the breach; for when the court of *Rome* began to menace and level its thunder at their heads, nineteen biſhops more aroſe with a noble intrepidity, and adopted their cauſe, in ſolemn remonſtrances, addreſſed both to the king of *France* and the Roman pontif. Theſe reſolute proteſters were joined by Anne Genevieve de Bourbon, ducheſs of *Longueville*, a heroine of the firſt rank both in birth and magnanimity, who, having renounced the pleaſures and vanities of the world, which had long employed her moſt ſerious thoughts, eſpouſed, with a devout ardour, the doctrines and cauſe of the *Janſeniſts*, and moſt earneſtly implored the clemency of the Roman pontif in their behalf. Moved by theſe entreaties, and alſo by other arguments and conſiderations of like moment, Clement IX. became ſo indulgent as to accept of a conditional ſubſcription to the famous declaration, and to permit doctors of ſcrupulous conſciences to ſign it according to the mental interpretation they thought proper to give it. This inſtance of papal condeſcenſion and lenity was no ſooner made public, than the Janſeniſts began to come forth from their lurking-places, to return from their voluntary exile, and to enjoy their former tranquillity and freedom, being exempt from all uneaſy apprehenſions of any further perſecution.

This remarkable event is commonly called the *Peace of* CLEMENT IX.; its duration, nevertheleſs, was but tranſitory [u]. It was violated in the year 1676, at the inſtigation of the Jeſuits, by LEWIS XIV., who declared, in a public edict, that it had only been granted for a time, out of a condeſcending indulgence to the tender and ſcrupulous conſciences of a certain number of perſons; but it was totally aboliſhed after the death of the ducheſs of LONGUEVILLE, which happened in the year 1679, and deprived the Janſeniſts of their principal ſupport. From that time their calamities were renewed; and they were purſued with the ſame malignity and rage that they had before experienced. Some of them avoided the riſing ſtorm by a voluntary exile; others ſuſtained it with invincible fortitude and conſtancy of mind; others turned aſide its fury, and eſcaped its violence, as well as they could, by dexterity and prudence. ANTHONY ARNAUD, who was the head and leader of the party, fled into *Holland* in the year 1679 [*w*]; and, in this retreat, he not only eſcaped the fury of his enemies, but had it in his power to hurt them conſiderably, and actually made the Jeſuits feel the weight of his talents and the extent of his influence. For the admirable eloquence and ſagacity of this great man gave him ſuch an aſcendant in the *Netherlands*, that the greateſt part of the churches there embraced his opinions, and adopted his cauſe; the Romiſh congregations in *Holland* alſo were, by his influence, and the miniſtry of his intimate friends and adherents, JOHN NEERCASSEL and PETER CODDEUS, biſhops of *Caſtorie* and *Sebaſto* [*x*], entirely gained over to the Janſeniſt party. Theſe latter ſtill perſevere with the utmoſt ſteadineſs in the principles of Janſeniſm; and, ſecured under the protection of the Dutch government, defy the threats, and hold in deriſion, the reſentment of the Roman pontifs [*y*].

---

[u] The tranſactions relating to this event, which were carried on under the pontificate of CLEMENT IX., are circumſtantially related by Cardinal ROSPIGNIOSI, in his *Commentarii*, which DU PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE has ſubjoined to his *Elementa Theologica*, publiſhed in 8vo at *Paris*, in the year 1716. See alſo this laſt-mentioned author's *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 336. in which the letters of CLEMENT IX. are inſerted. Two Janſeniſts have written the Hiſtory of the *Clementine Peace*. VARET, vicar to the archbiſhop of *Sens*, in an anonymous work entitled, *Relation de ce qui s'eſt paſſé dans l'affaire de la Paix de l'Egliſe ſous la Pape* CLEMENT IX.; and QUESNEL, in an anonymous production alſo, entitled, *La Paix de* CLEMENT IX., *ou Demonſtration des deux fauſſetés capitales avancées dans l'Hiſtoire des Cinq Propoſitions contre la foi des diſciples de St.* AUGUSTIN. That VARET was the author of the former, is aſſerted in the *Catéchiſme Hiſtorique ſur les conteſtations de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 352; and that the latter came from the pen of QUESNEL, we learn from the writer of *Bibliothéque Janſéniſte*, p. 314.—There was another accurate and intereſting account of this tranſaction publiſhed in the year 1706, in two volumes 8vo, under the following title: *Relation de ce qui s'eſt paſſé dans l'affaire de la paix de l'Egliſe ſous le Pape* CLEMENT IX., *avec les Lettres, Actes, Mémoires, et autres pièces qui y ont rapport*.—The important ſervices that the ducheſs of *Longueville* rendered the Janſeniſts in this affair are related with elegance and ſpirit by VILLEFORT, in his *Vie d'Anne Genevieve de Bourbon, Ducheſſe de Longueville*, tom. ii. livr. vi. p. 89, of the edition of *Amſterdam* (1739), which is more complete and ample than the edition of *Paris*.

XLVI. It

[*w*] For an account of this great man, ſee BAYLE's *Dictionary*, vol. i. at the article ANTHONY ARNAUD; as alſo *Hiſtoire abregée de la vie et des ouvrages de M.* ARNAUD, publiſhed at *Cologn*, in 8vo.—The change introduced into the Romiſh churches in *Holland* is mentioned by LAFITAU, *Vie de* CLEMENT XI., tom. i. p. 123. For an account of CODDEUS, NEERCASSEL, and VARET, and the other patrons of Janſeniſm among the Dutch, ſee the *Dictionnaire des Livres Janſeniſtes*, tom. i. p. 48. 21. 353. tom. ii. p. 406. tom. iv. p. 119.

[*x*] Biſhops *In partibus infidelium.*

☞ [*y*] It muſt however be obſerved, that, notwithſtanding

The auſtere piety of the Janſeniſts.

XLVI. It is not only on account of their embracing the doctrine of AUGUSTINE concerning Divine Grace (a doctrine which bears a ſtriking reſemblance with that of the Calviniſts), that the Janſeniſts have incurred the diſpleaſure and reſentment of the Jeſuits. They are charged with many other circumſtances, which appear intolerable to the warm votaries of the church of *Rome*. And indeed it is certain, that the various controverſies, which have been mentioned above, were excited in that church principally by the Janſeniſts, and have been propagated and handed down by them, even to our times, in a prodigious multitude of their books publiſhed both in *France* and in the *Netherlands* [z]. But that which offends moſt the Jeſuits, and the other creatures of the Pontif, is the auſterity of this party, and the ſeverity that reigns in their ſyſtem of moral diſcipline and practical religion. For the Janſeniſts cry out againſt the corruptions of the church of *Rome*, and complain that neither its doctrines nor morals retain any traces of their former purity. They reproach the clergy with an univerſal depravation of ſentiments and manners, and entire forgetfulneſs of the dignity of their character and the duties of their vocation. They cenſure the licentiouſneſs of the monaſtic Orders, and inſiſt upon the neceſſity of reforming their diſcipline according to the rules of ſanctity, abſtinence, and ſelf-denial, that were originally preſcribed by their reſpective founders. They maintain alſo, that the people ought to be carefully inſtructed in all the doctrines and precepts

---

the aſcendant the Janſeniſts have in *Holland*, the Jeſuits, for ſome time paſt, have by artifice and diſguiſe got a conſiderable footing among the Romiſh churches that are tolerated by the republic.

[z] See *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Rom.* Sæc. xvi. § xxxi.

of Chriſtianity, and that, for this purpoſe, the Holy Scriptures and Public Liturgies ſhould be offered to their peruſal in their mother-tongue; and, finally, they look upon it as a matter of the higheſt moment to perſuade all Chriſtians that true piety does not conſiſt in the obſervance of pompous rites, or in the performance of external acts of devotion, but in inward holineſs and divine love.

Theſe ſentiments of the Janſeniſts, on a general view, ſeem juſt and rational, and ſuitable to the ſpirit and genius of Chriſtianity; but, when we examine the particular branches into which they extend theſe general principles, the conſequences they deduce from them, and the manner in which they apply them, in their rules of diſcipline and practice, we ſhall find, that the piety of this famous party is deeply tinged both with ſuperſtition and fanaticiſm; that it more eſpecially favours the harſh and enthuſiaſtical opinion of the *Myſtics*; and, of conſequence, that the Janſeniſts are not undeſervedly branded by their adverſaries with the denomination of *Rigouriſts* [a]. This denomination they merited, in a peculiar manner, by their doctrine concerning Repentance and Penance,

---

[a] They who deſire to form a juſt notion of the diſmal piety of the Janſeniſts (which carries the unſeemly features of that gloomy devotion that was formerly practiſed by fanatical hermits in the deſerts of *Syria*, *Lybia*, and *Egypt*, but is entirely foreign from the dictates of reaſon and the amiable ſpirit of Chriſtianity), have only to peruſe the epiſtles and other writings of the *Abbot of* St. Cyran, who is the great oracle of the party. This abbot was a well-meaning man; and his piety, ſuch as it was, carried in it the marks of ſincerity and fervor; he was alſo ſuperior, perhaps, as a paſtor, to the greateſt part of the Roman catholic doctors; and his learning, more eſpecially his knowledge of religious antiquity, was very conſiderable: but to propoſe this man as a complete and perfect model of *genuine* piety, and as a moſt accurate and accompliſhed teacher of *Chriſtian* virtue, is an abſurdity peculiar to the Janſeniſts, and can be adopted by no perſon who knows what *genuine* piety and *Chriſtian* virtue are. That we may

---

may not ſeem to detract raſhly, and without reaſon, from the merit of this eminent man, it will not be improper to confirm what we have ſaid by ſome inſtances. This good abbot, having undertaken to vanquiſh the *Heretics* (*i. e.* the Proteſtants) in a prolix and extenſive work, was obliged to read, or at leaſt to look into, the various writings publiſhed by that *impious tribe*; and this he did in company with his nephew MARTIN DE BARCOS, who reſembled him entirely in his ſentiments and manners. But before he would venture to open a book compoſed by a Proteſtant, he conſtantly marked it with the *ſign of the croſs*, to expel the *evil ſpirit*. What weakneſs and ſuperſtition did this ridiculous proceeding diſcover! for the good man was perſuaded that *Satan* had fixed his reſidence in the books of the Proteſtants; but it was not ſo eaſy to determine where he imagined the wicked ſpirit lay, whether in the paper, in the letters, between the leaves, or in the doctrines of theſe *infernal* productions? Let us ſee the account that is given of this matter by LANCELOT, in his *Mémoires touchant la vie de M. l'Abbé de S. Cyran*, tom. i. p. 226. His words are as follows: *Il liſoit ces livres avec tant de piété, qu'en les prenant il les exorciſoit toujours en faiſant la ſigne de la Croix deſſus, ne doutant point que le Démon n'y reſidoit actuellement.* His attachment to AUGUSTINE was ſo exceſſive, that he looked upon as ſacred and divine even thoſe opinions of that great man, which the wiſer part of the Romiſh doctors had rejected as erroneous and highly dangerous. Such, among others, was that extravagant and pernicious tenet, that *the ſaints are the only lawful proprietors of the world*; and that *the wicked have no right, by the divine law, to thoſe things which they poſſeſs juſtly, in conſequence of the deciſions of human law*. To this purpoſe is the following aſſertion of our abbot, as we find it in FONTAINE'S *Mémoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de Port-Royal*, tom. i. p. 201. *Jeſus Chriſt n'eſt encore entré dans la poſſeſſion de ſon Royaume temporel, et des biens du monde qui lui appartiennent, que par cette* PETITE PORTION *qu'en tient l'Egliſe par les bénéfices de ſes Clercs, qui ne ſont que les fermiers et les depoſitaires de Jeſus Chriſt.* If, therefore, we are to give credit to this viſionary man, the golden age is approaching, when JESUS CHRIST, having pulled down the mighty from their ſeats, and dethroned the kings and princes of the earth, ſhall reduce the whole world under his ſole dominion, and give it over to the government of prieſts and monks, who are the *princes* of his church.—After we have ſeen ſuch ſentiments as theſe maintained by their oracle and chief, it is but natural to be ſurpriſed when we hear the Janſe-

Penance, whoſe tendency, conſidered both in a civil and religious point of view, is ſingularly

---

niſts boaſting of their zeal in defending ſovereign ſtates, and in general the civil rights of mankind, againſt the ſtratagems and uſurpations of the Roman pontifs.

The notions of the abbot of ST. CYRAN concerning *prayer*, which breathe the fanatical ſpirit of myſticiſm, will further confirm what we have ſaid of his propenſity to enthuſiaſm. It is, for example, a favourite maxim with him, that the Chriſtian who prays, ought never to recollect the good things he ſtands in need of in order to aſk them of God, ſince true prayer does not conſiſt in diſtinct notions and clear ideas of what we are doing in that ſolemn act, but in a certain *blind impulſe* of divine love. Such is the account given of the abbot's ſentiments on this head by LANCELOT, in his *Memoires touchant la vie de l'Abbé de S. Cyran*, tom. ii. p. 44.—*Il ne croyoit pas*, ſays that author, *que l'on pût faire quelque effort pour s'appliquer à quelque point, ou à quelque penſée particuliere—parce que la veritable priere eſt plutôt un attrait de ſon amour, qui emporte notre cœur vers lui, et nous enleve comme hors de nous mêmes, que non pas une occupation de notre eſprit, qui ſe rempliſſe de l'idée de quelque objet quoique divin.* According to this hypotheſis, the man prays beſt who neither *thinks* nor *aſks* in that act of devotion. This is, indeed, a very extraordinary account of the matter, and contains an idea of prayer which ſeems to have been quite unknown to CHRIST and his *Apoſtles*; for the *former* has commanded us to addreſs our prayers to God in a ſet form of words; and the *latter* frequently tell us the ſubjects of their petitions and ſupplications.

But of all the errors of this Arch-janſeniſt, none was ſo pernicious as the fanatical notion he entertained of his being the *reſidence* of the Deity, the *inſtrument* of the Godhead, by which the *divine nature* itſelf eſſentially operated. It was in conſequence of this dangerous principle, that he recommends it as a duty incumbent on all pious men to follow, without conſulting their judgment or any other guide, the *firſt motions* and *impulſes* of their minds, as the dictates of heaven. And indeed the Janſeniſts, in general, are intimately perſuaded, that God *operates* immediately upon the minds of thoſe who have compoſed, or rather ſuppreſſed, all the motions of the *underſtanding* and of the *will*, and that to ſuch he declares, from above, his intentions and commands; ſince whatever thoughts, deſigns, or inclinations ariſe within them, in this calm ſtate of tranquillity and ſilence, are to be conſidered as the direct ſuggeſtions and oracles of the divine wiſdom. See, for a further account of this peſtilential doctrine, *Memoires de Port-Royal*, tom. iii. p. 246.

pernicious. For they make repentance conſiſt chiefly in thoſe voluntary ſufferings, which the tranſgreſſor inflicts upon himſelf, in proportion to the nature of his crimes and the degree of his guilt. As their notions of the extent of man's original corruption are greatly exaggerated, they preſcribe remedies to it that are of the ſame nature. They look upon Chriſtians as bound to expiate this original guilt by acts of mortification performed in ſolitude and ſilence, by torturing and macerating their bodies, by painful labour, exceſſive abſtinence, continual prayer and contemplation; and they hold every perſon obliged to increaſe theſe voluntary pains and ſufferings, in proportion to the degree of corruption they have derived from nature, or contracted by a vicious and licentious courſe of life. Nay, they carry theſe auſterities to ſo high a pitch, that they do not ſcruple to call thoſe *holy* ſelf-tormentors, who have gradually put an end to their days by exceſſive abſtinence or labour, the *ſacred victims of repentance*, that have been *conſumed* by the *fire* of divine love. Not ſatisfied with this *fanatical* language, they go ſtill farther, and *ſuperſtitiouſly* maintain, that the conduct of theſe ſelf-murderers is peculiarly meritorious in the eye of heaven; and that their ſufferings, macerations, and labours, appeaſe the anger of the Deity, and not only contribute to their own felicity, but draw down abundant bleſſings upon their friends and upon the church. We might confirm this account by various examples, and more eſpecially by that of the famous Abbè DE PARIS, the great wonder-worker of the Janſeniſts, who put himſelf to a moſt painful death, in order to ſatisfy the juſtice of an incenſed God [b]; ſuch was the picture he had formed of the Beſt of Beings in his diſordered fancy.

---

[b] See MORINUS, *Com. de Pœnitentia*, *Præf.* p. 3. in which there is a tacit cenſure of the penance of the Janſeniſts. —See,

The convent of *Port-Royal.*

XLVII. A ſtriking example of this auſtere, forbidding, and extravagant ſpecies of devotion was exhibited in that celebrated female convent called *Port-Royal in the fields*, which was ſituated in a retired, deep, and gloomy vale, not far from *Paris*. The inſpection and government of this auſtere ſociety was given by HENRY IV., about the commencement of this century, to JAQUELINE, daughter of ANTHONY ARNAUD [*c*], who, after her converſion, aſſumed the name of MARIE ANGELIQUE DE LA ST. MADELAINE. This lady had at firſt led a very diſſolute life [*d*], which was the general caſe of the cloiſtered fair in *France*, about this period; but a remarkable change happened in her ſentiments and manners, in the year 1609, when ſhe reſolved no more to live like a nun, but to conſecrate her future days to deep devotion and penitential exerciſes. This holy reſolution was ſtrengthened by her acquaintance with the famous FRANÇOIS DE SALES, and the abbot of ST. CYRAN. The laſt of theſe pious connexions ſhe formed in the year 1623, and modelled both her own conduct and the manners of

---

—See, on the other hand, the *Memoires de Port-Royal*, p. 483. —The Janſeniſts, among all the *meritorious* actions of the abbot of ST. CYRAN, find none more worthy of admiration and applauſe than his reſtoring from oblivion the true ſyſtem of penitential diſcipline; and they conſider him as the ſecond author or parent of the doctrine of penance. See *Memoires de Port-Royal*, tom. iii. p. 445, 504.—This very doctrine, however, of penance was one of the principal reaſons of his being committed to priſon by the order of Cardinal RICHELIEU. *Ibid.* tom. i. p. 233, 452.

[*c*] An eminent lawyer, and father to the famous ARNAUD, doctor in *Sorbonne*.

☞ [*d*] The diſſolute life imputed to this abbeſs by Dr. MOSHEIM is an egregious miſtake, which ſeems to have proceeded from his miſunderſtanding a paſſage in BAYLE's *Dictionary*, vol. i. p. 338. note F, fourth edition in French.

her convent after the doctrine and example of theſe devout men. Hence it happened, that, during the whole courſe of this century, the convent of *Port-Royal* excited the indignation of the Jeſuits, the admiration of the Janſeniſts, and the attention of *Europe*. The holy virgins of this famous ſociety obſerved, with the utmoſt rigour and exactneſs, that ancient rule of the Ciſtercians, which had been almoſt every where abrogated on account of its exceſſive and intolerable auſterity; nay, they even went beyond its moſt cruel demands [e]. Such was the fame of this devout nunnery, that multitudes of pious perſons were ambitious to dwell in its neighbourhood, and that a great part of the *Janſeniſt-penitents*, or ſelf-tormentors, of both ſexes, built huts without its precincts, where they imitated the manners of thoſe auſtere and gloomy fanatics, who, in the fourth and fifth centuries, retired into the wild and uncultivated places of *Syria* and *Egypt*, and were commonly called, *The Fathers of the Deſart*. The end which theſe Penitents had in view was, by ſilence, hunger, thirſt, prayer, bodily labour,

---

[e] There is a prodigious multitude of books ſtill extant, in which the riſe, progreſs, laws, and ſanctity of this famous convent are deſcribed and extolled by eminent Janſeniſts, who, at the ſame time, deplore its fate in the moſt doleful ſtrains. Of this multitude we ſhall mention thoſe only which are eaſy to be acquired, and which contain the moſt modern and circumſtantial accounts of that celebrated eſtabliſhment.—The Benedictines of *St. Maur* have given an exact though dry hiſtory of this convent in their *Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. vii. p. 910. A more elegant and agreeable account of it; but an account charged with imperfection and partiality, was compoſed by the famous poet RACINE, under the title of *Abrégé de l'Hiſtoire de Port-Royal*; and was publiſhed, after having paſſed through many preceding editions, in the year 1750, at *Amſterdam*, among the works of his ſon LEWIS RACINE, tom. ii. p. 275—366. The external ſtate and form of this convent are profeſſedly deſcribed by MOLEON, in his *Voyages Liturgiques*, p. 234.—Add to theſe, NIC. FONTAINE, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de Port-Royal*, publiſhed at *Cologn* (or rather at *Utrecht*) in two volumes 8vo, in the year 1738.—DU FOSSE, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de Port-Royal*.—*Recueil de pluſieurs pieces pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de Port-Royal*, publiſhed at *Utrecht*, in 8vo, in the year 1740.—The editor of this laſt compilation promiſes, in his Preface, further collections of pieces relative to the ſame ſubject, and ſeems to inſinuate, that a complete hiſtory of *Port-Royal*, drawn from theſe and other valuable and authentic records, will ſooner or later ſee the light. See, beſides the authors abovementioned, LANCELOT, *Memoires touchant la Vie de l'Abbé de S. Cyran*. All theſe authors confine their relations to the external form and various revolutions of this famous convent. Its internal ſtate, its rules of diſcipline,

---

diſcipline, the manners of its virgins, and the incidents and tranſactions that have happened between them and the holy neighbourhood of Janſeniſts, are deſcribed and related by another ſet of writers; ſee *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de Port-Royal, et à la Vie de* MARIE ANGELIQUE D'ARNAUD, publiſhed at *Utrecht* in 5 vols. 8vo, in the year 1742.—*Vies intereſſantes et edifiantes des religieuſes de Port-Royal, et de pluſieurs perſonnes qui leur étoient attachées.* There are already four volumes of this work publiſhed, of which the firſt appeared at *Utrecht* in the year 1750, in 8vo, and it muſt be acknowledged, that they all contain ſeveral anecdotes and records that are intereſting and curious.—For an account of the ſuppreſſion and abolition of this convent, ſee the *Memoires ſur la deſtruction de l'Abbaye de Port-Royal des Champs*, publiſhed in 8vo, in 1711. If we are not much miſtaken, all theſe hiſtories and relations have been much leſs ſerviceable to the reputation of this famous convent than the Janſeniſt party are willing to think. When we view ARNAUD, TILLEMONT, NICOLE, LE MAITRE, and the other authors of *Port-Royal*, in their learned productions, they then appear truly great; but, when we lay aſide their works, and, taking up theſe hiſtories of *Port-Royal*, ſee theſe great men in private life, in the conſtant practice of that auſtere diſcipline of which the Janſeniſts boaſt ſo fooliſhly, they indeed then ſhrink almoſt to nothing, appear in the contemptible light of fanatics, and ſeem totally unworthy of the fame they have acquired. When we read the *Diſcourſes* that ISAAC LE MAÎTRE, commonly called SACY, pronounced at the bar, together with his other ingenious productions, we cannot refuſe him the applauſe that is due to ſuch an elegant and accompliſhed writer; but when we meet with this polite author at *Port-Royal*, mixed with labourers and reapers, and with the ſpade or the ſickle in his hand, he then certainly makes a comical figure, and can ſcarcely be looked upon as perfectly right in his head.

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I.

watchings, ſorrow, and other voluntary acts of ſelf-denial, to efface the guilt, and remove the pollution the ſoul had derived from natural corruptions or evil habits [*f*]. They did not, however, all obſerve the ſame diſcipline, or follow the ſame kind of application and labour. The more learned conſumed their ſtrength in compoſing laborious productions filled with ſacred and profane erudition, and ſome of theſe have, no doubt, deſerved well of the republic of letters: others were employed in teaching youth the rudiments of language and the principles of ſcience; but the far greateſt part exhauſted both the health of their bodies and the vigour of their minds in ſervile induſtry and rural labour; and thus pined away by a ſlow kind of death. What is ſingularly ſurpriſing is that many of theſe voluntary victims of an inhuman piety were perſons illuſtrious both by their birth and ſtations, who after having diſtinguiſhed themſelves in civil or military employments, debaſed themſelves ſo far in this penitential retreat, as to aſſume the character, offices, and labour of the loweſt ſervants.

This celebrated retreat of the devout and auſtere Janſeniſts was ſubject to many viciſſitudes during the whole courſe of this century: at one time it flouriſhed in unrivalled glory; at another it ſeemed eclipſed, and on the brink of ruin. At length, however, the period of its total extinction approached. The nuns obſtinately refuſed to ſubſcribe the declaration of Pope ALEXANDER VII., that has been ſo often mentioned; on the other hand, their convent and rule of diſcipline was conſidered as detrimental to the intereſts of the kingdom, and a diſhonour to ſome of the firſt families in *France*; hence LEWIS XIV., in the year 1709, ſet on by the violent counſels of the Jeſuits, ordered the convent of *Port-Royal* to be demoliſhed, the whole building to be levelled with the ground, and the nuns to be removed to *Paris*. And, leſt there ſhould ſtill remain ſome ſecret fuel to nouriſh the flame of ſuperſtition in that place, he ordered the very carcaſſes of the nuns and devout Janſeniſts to be dug up and buried elſewhere.

[*f*] Among the firſt and moſt eminent of theſe penitents was ISAAC LE MAITRE, a celebrated lawyer at *Paris*, whoſe eloquence had procured him a ſhining reputation, and who, in the year 1637, retired to *Port-Royal* to make expiation for his ſins. The retreat of this eminent man raiſed new enemies to the abbot of ST. CYRAN. See the *Memoires pour l'Hiſtoire de Port-Royal*, tom. i. p. 233.—The example of LE MAITRE was followed by a vaſt number of perſons of all ranks, and, among theſe, by ſome perſons of the higheſt diſtinction. See *Vies des Religieuſes de Port-Royal*, tom. i. p. 141.

The controverſy concerning the *Immaculate Conception of the Virgin* MARY.

XLVIII. The other controverſies that diſturbed the tranquillity of the church of *Rome*, were but light blaſts when compared with this violent hurricane. The old debate between the Franciſcans and Dominicans, concerning the *Immaculate Conception of the Virgin* MARY, which was maintained by the former, and denied by the latter, gave much trouble and perplexity to the Roman pontifs, and more eſpecially to PAUL V., GREGORY XV., and ALEXANDER VII. The kingdom of *Spain* was thrown into ſuch combuſtion, and ſo miſerably divided into factions by this controverſy, about the beginning of this century, that ſolemn embaſſies were ſent to *Rome*, both by PHILIP III. and his ſucceſſor, with a view to engage the Roman pontif to determine the queſtion, or, at any rate, to put an end to the conteſt by a public bull. But, notwithſtanding the weighty ſolicitations of theſe monarchs, the oracle of *Rome* pronounced nothing but ambiguous words, and its high prieſts prudently avoided coming to a plain and poſitive deciſion of the matter in queſtion. For if they were awed, on the one hand, by the warm remonſtrances of the Spaniſh court, which favoured the ſentiment of the Franciſcans, they were reſtrained, on the other, by the credit and influence of the Dominicans. So that, after the moſt earneſt entreaties and importunities, all that could be obtained from the pontif, by the court of *Spain*, was a declaration, intimating, that the opinion of the Franciſcans had a high degree of probability on its ſide, and forbidding the Dominicans to oppoſe it in a public manner; but this declaration was accompanied with another [g], by which the Franciſcans were prohibited, in their turn, from treating as erroneous the doctrine of the Dominicans. This pacific accommodation of matters would have been highly laudable in a prince or civil magiſtrate, who, unacquainted with theological queſtions of ſuch an abſtruſe nature, preferred the tranquillity of his people to the diſcuſſion of ſuch an intricate and unimportant point; but whether it was honourable to the Roman pontif, who boaſts of a Divine right to decide all religious controverſies, and pretends to a degree of inſpiration that places him beyond the poſſibility of erring, we leave to the conſideration of thoſe who have his glory at heart.

---

[g] See Frid. Ulr. Calixti *Hiſtoria Immaculatæ Conceptionis B. Virginis* Mariæ, publiſhed at *Helmſtadt* in 4to, in the year 1696.—Hornbeckii *Comm. ad Bullam* Urbani VIII., *de diebus Feſtis*, p. 250.—Launoii *Præſcriptiones de Conceptu Virginis* Mariæ, tom. i. p. i. oper. p. 9.—Long after this period, Clement XI. went a ſtep further, and appointed, in the year 1708, a feſtival to be celebrated, in honour of the *Immaculate Conception of the Virgin* Mary, throughout the Romiſh church. See the *Memoires de Trévoux*, for the year 1709, art. xxxvii. p. 514. But the Dominicans obſtinately deny that the obligation of this law extends to them, and perſiſt in maintaining their ancient doctrine, though with more modeſty and circumſpection than they formerly diſcovered in this debate. And when we conſider that this doctrine of theirs has never been expreſsly condemned by any pope, and that they are not in the leaſt moleſted, nor even cenſured, for refuſing to celebrate the feſtival abovementioned, it appears evidently, from all this, that the terms of the papal edict are to be underſtood with certain reſtrictions, and interpreted in a mild and indulgent manner; and that the ſpirit of this edict is not contrary to the tenor of the former declarations of the pontifs on this head. See Lamindus Pritanius (a fictitious name aſſumed by the author Muratori) *De ingeniorum moderatione in religionis negotio*, p. 254.

Quietiſm, or the controverſies occaſioned by the doctrine of Molinos.

XLIX. The controverſies with the Myſtics were now renewed, and that ſect, which in former times enjoyed ſuch a high degree of reputation and authority, was treated with the greateſt ſeverity, and involved in the deepeſt diſtreſs towards the concluſion of this century. This unhappy change in their affairs was principally occaſioned by the fanaticiſm and imprudence of MICHAEL DE MOLINOS, a Spaniſh prieſt, who reſided at *Rome*, and the fame of whoſe ardent piety and devotion procured him a conſiderable number of diſciples of both ſexes. A book publiſhed at *Rome*, in the year 1681, by this eccleſiaſtic, under the title of the *Spiritual Guide*, alarmed the doctors of the church [*h*]. This book contained, beſides the uſual precepts and inſtitutions of Myſtic theology, ſeveral notions relating to a *ſpiritual* and *contemplative life*, that ſeemed to revive the pernicious and infernal errors of the *Beghards*, and open a door to all ſorts of diſſolution and licentiouſneſs. The principles of MOLINOS, which have been very differently interpreted by his friends and enemies, amount to this: "That the " whole of religion conſiſts in the perfect *calm* " and *tranquillity* of a mind removed from all " external and finite things, and centered in God, " and in ſuch a *pure love* of the Supreme Being, " as is independent on all proſpect of intereſt or " reward;" or, to expreſs the doctrine of this Myſtic in other words, "The ſoul, in the pur" ſuit of the *ſupreme good*, muſt retire from the " reports and gratifications of ſenſe, and, in ge" neral, from all corporeal objects, and, impo" ſing ſilence upon all the motions of the under" ſtanding and will, muſt be *abſorbed* in the " Deity." Hence the denomination of *Quietiſts* was given to the followers of MOLINOS; though that of *Myſtics*, which was their vulgar title, was more applicable, and expreſſed with more propriety their fanatical ſyſtem. For the doctrine of MOLINOS had no other circumſtance of novelty attending it, than the ſingular and unuſual terms he employed in unfolding his notions, and the ingenuity he diſcovered in digeſting what the ancient Myſtics had thrown out in the moſt confuſed and incoherent jargon, into ſomething that looked like a ſyſtem. The Jeſuits, and other zealous votaries of *Rome*, ſoon perceived that the ſyſtem of MOLINOS was a tacit cenſure of the Romiſh church, as having departed from the ſpirit of true religion, by placing the eſſence of piety in external works, and in the performance of a certain round of rites and ceremonies. But the warmeſt opponents MOLINOS met with was from the French ambaſſador [i] at *Rome*, who raiſed a moſt violent perſecution againſt him. This made many imagine, that it was not the theological ſyſtem of MOLINOS alone that had inflamed the reſentment of that miniſter, but that ſome conſiderations of a political nature had been blended with this famous controverſy, and that the Spaniſh Myſtic had oppoſed the deſigns and negociations of the French monarch at the court of *Rome*. However that may have been, MOLINOS, unable to reſiſt the ſtorm, and abandoned by thoſe from whom he chiefly expected ſuccour, yielded to it, in the year 1685, when, notwithſtanding the number, rank, and credit of his friends at *Rome*, and the particular marks of favour he had received from the Roman pontif [k], he was caſt into priſon. Two years after this, he was obliged to renounce, in a public manner, the errors of which he was accuſed, and this ſolemn recantation was followed by a ſentence of perpetual impriſonment, from which he was, in an advanced age, delivered by death, in the year 1696 [l]. The candid and impartial will be obliged to acknowledge, that the opinions and expreſſions of this enthuſiaſt were perfidiouſly miſrepreſented and perverted by the Jeſuits and others, whoſe intereſt it was that he ſhould be put out of the way, and excluded from every thing but contemplation and repoſe; and it is moſt certain, that this doctrine was charged with conſequences which he neither approved nor even apprehended. But, on the other hand, it muſt alſo be confeſſed, that the ſyſtem of MOLINOS was chargeable with the greateſt part of the reproaches that are juſtly thrown upon the Myſtics, and favoured much the illuſions and follies of thoſe fanatics, who would make the crude viſions of their diſordered fancies paſs for Divine revelations [*m*].

[*h*] This book, which was compoſed in Spaniſh, and publiſhed, for the firſt time, in the year 1675, was honoured with the approbation and encomiums of many eminent and reſpectable perſonages. It was publiſhed in Italian in ſeveral places, and at length at *Rome*, in 1681. It was afterwards tranſlated into French, Dutch, and Latin, and paſſed through ſeveral editions in *France*, *Italy*, and *Holland*. The Latin tranſlation, which bears the title of *Manuductio Spiritualis*, was publiſhed at *Halle*, in the year 1687, in 8vo, by FRANK. There is another work of MOLINOS, compoſed in the ſame ſpirit, *Concerning the daily celebration of the Communion*, which was alſo condemned. See the *Recueil de diverſes pieces concernant le Quietiſme et les Quietiſtes, ou* MOLINOS *ſes ſentimens et ſes diſciples*, publiſhed in 8vo at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1688, in which the reader will find a French tranſlation of the *Spiritual Guide*; together with a collection of Letters on various ſubjects, written by MOLINOS.

---

[i] Cardinal D'ETREES.

---

[k] INNOCENT XI.

[l] He was born in the dioceſe of *Saragoſſa*, in the year 1627; ſee *Biblioth. Janſeniſte*, p. 469.—For an account of this controverſy, ſee the *Narrative of the Proceedings of the Controverſy concerning Quietiſm*, which is ſubjoined to the German tranſlation of BURNET's Travels.—As alſo ARNOLDI *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. et Hæretic.* tom. iii. c. xvii. p. 176.—JAEGERI *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. et Polit.* Sæculi xvii. Decenn. ix. p. 26.—PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 357, where may be ſeen the papal edicts relating to this controverſy.

Followers of Molinos.

L. It would have been truly ſurpriſing had a ſyſtem of piety, that was ſo adapted to ſeduce the indolent mind, to captivate the warm imagination, and to melt the tender heart, been deſtitute of votaries and followers. But this was by no means the caſe. In *Italy*, *Spain*, *France*, and the *Netherlands*, MOLINOS had a conſiderable number of diſciples, and, beſides the reaſons we have now hinted, another circumſtance muſt have contributed much to multiply his votaries; for, in all parts of the Romiſh dominion, there were numbers of perſons, who had ſenſe and knowledge enough to perceive, that the whole of religion could not conſiſt in external rites and bodily mortifications, but too little to direct themſelves in religious matters, or to ſubſtitute what was right in the place of what they knew to be wrong; and hence it was natural enough for them to follow the firſt plauſible guide that was offered to them. But the church of *Rome*, apprehenſive of the conſequences of this Myſtic theology, left no method unemployed that could contribute to ſtop its progreſs; and, by the force of promiſings and threatenings, of ſeverity and mildneſs properly applied, ſtifled in the birth the commotions and changes it ſeemed adapted to excite. The death of MOLINOS contributed alſo to diſpel the anxiety of the Romiſh doctors, ſince his diſciples and followers ſeemed too inconſiderable to deſerve any notice. Among theſe are generally reckoned Cardinal PETRUCCI, FRANCIS DE LA COMBE, a Barnabite friar, the ſpiritual director of *Madame* GUYON (who ſhall be mentioned more particularly), FRANCIS MALAVALLE, BERNIERE DE LOUVIGNI, and others of leſs note. Theſe enthuſiaſts, as is common among the Myſtics, differ from MOLINOS in ſeveral points, and are alſo divided among themſelves; this diverſity is, however, rather nominal than real; and, if we conſider the true ſignification of the terms by which they expreſs their reſpective notions, we ſhall find that they all ſet out from the ſame principles, and tend to the ſame concluſions [*n*].

[*m*] All that can be alleged in defence of MOLINOS has been gathered together by WEISMANNUS, in his *Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſt.* Sæc. xvii. p. 555.

The caſe of Madame Guyon and Fenelon.

LI. One of the principal patrons and propagators of *Quietiſm* in *France* was MARIE BOUVIERES DE LA MOTHE GUYON, a woman of faſhion, remarkable for the goodneſs of her heart and the regularity of her manners, but of an inconſtant and unſettled temper, and ſubject to be drawn away by the ſeduction of a warm and unbridled fancy. This female apoſtle of Myſticiſm derived all her ideas of religion from the feelings of her own heart [*o*], and deſcribed its nature to others according as ſhe felt it herſelf; a manner of proceeding of all others the moſt uncertain and deluſive. And accordingly, her religious ſentiments made a great noiſe in the year 1687, and gave offence to many. Hence, after they had been accurately and attentively examined by ſeveral men of eminent piety and learning, they were, at length, pronounced erroneous and unſound, and, in the year 1697, were profeſſedly confuted by the celebrated BOSSUET. This gave riſe to a controverſy of ſtill greater moment, between the prelate laſt mentioned and FRANCIS SALIGNAC DE FENELON, archbiſhop of *Cambray*, whoſe ſublime virtue and ſuperior genius were beheld with veneration in all the countries of *Europe*. Of theſe two diſputants, who, in point of eloquence, were avowedly without either ſuperiors or equals in *France*, the latter ſeemed diſpoſed to favour the religious ſyſtem of Madame GUYON. For when BOSSUET deſired his approbation of the book he had compoſed, in anſwer to the ſentiments of that female Myſtic, FENELON not only refuſed it, but openly declared that this pious woman had been treated with great partiality and injuſtice, and that the cenſures of her adverſary were unmerited and groundleſs. Nor did the warm imagination of this amiable prelate permit him to ſtop here, where the dictates of prudence ought to have ſet bounds to his zeal; for, in the year 1697, he publiſhed a book [*p*], in which he adopted ſeveral of the tenets of Madame GUYON, and more eſpecially that favourite doctrine of the Myſtics, which teaches, that the love of the Supreme Being muſt be pure and diſintereſted; that

---

[*n*] The writings of theſe fanatics are enumerated and ſharply criticiſed by COLONIA, in the *Bibliotheque Quietiſte* (which he has ſubjoined to his *Bibliotheque Janſeniſte)*, p. 455—488.—See alſo GOD. ARNOLDI *Hiſtoria et Deſcriptio Theologiæ Myſticæ*, p. 364, & POIRET's *Bibliotheca Myſticorum*, publiſhed at *Amſterdam*, in 8vo, in 1708.

[*o*] Madame GUYON wrote her own life and ſpiritual adventures in French, and publiſhed them in the year 1720. Her writings, which abound with childiſh allegories and myſtic ejaculations, have been tranſlated into German. Her principal production was *La Bible de Mad.* GUYON, *avec des explications et reflections qui regardent la vie interieure.* This *Bible with Annotations relating to the hidden or internal life*, was publiſhed in the year 1715, at *Amſterdam*, under the name of *Cologn*, in twenty volumes in 8vo, which abundantly diſcover the

---

the fertile imagination and ſhallow judgment of this female myſtic.—See a further account of her in the *Letters* of *Mad. de* MAINTENON, tom. i. p. 249. tom. ii. p. 45, 47, 49, 51.

[*p*] This book was entitled, *Explication des Maxims des Saints ſur la vie intérieure.* It has been tranſlated into Latin.

is, exempt from all views of intereſt and all hope of reward [q]. This doctrine FENELON explained with a pathetic eloquence, and confirmed it by the authority of many of the moſt eminent and pious among the Romiſh doctors. BOSSUET, whoſe leading paſſion was ambition, and who beheld with anxiety the riſing fame and eminent talents of FENELON as an obſtacle to his glory, was highly exaſperated by this oppoſition, and left no method unemployed which artifice and jealouſy could ſuggeſt, to mortify a rival whoſe illuſtrious merit had rendered ſo formidable. For this purpoſe, he threw himſelf at the feet of LEWIS XIV., implored the ſuccours of the Roman pontif, and, by his importunities and ſtratagems, obtained, at length, the condemnation of FENELON's book. This condemnation was pronounced in the year 1699, by INNOCENT XII., who, in a public brief, declared that book unſound in general, and branded with more peculiar marks of diſapprobation twenty-three propoſitions, ſpecified by the *Congregation* that had been appointed to examine it. The book, however, was condemned alone, without any mention of the author; and the con-

---

☞ [q] This doctrine of the Myſtics has thus far a foundation in reaſon and philoſophy, that the moral perfections of the Deity are, in themſelves, *intrinſically amiable*; and that their *excellence* is as much adapted to excite our eſteem and love, as the experience of their beneficent effects in promoting our well being, is to enflame our gratitude. The error, therefore, of the Myſtics lay in their drawing extravagant concluſions from a right principle, and in their requiring in their followers a perpetual abſtraction and ſeparation of ideas which are intimately connected, and, as it were, blended together, ſuch as *felicity* and *perfection*; for though theſe two are inſeparable in fact, yet the Myſtics, from a fantaſtic pretenſion to diſintereſtedneſs, would ſeparate them right or wrong, and turned their whole attention to the latter. In their views alſo of the ſupreme Being, they overlooked the important relations he bears to us as *benefactor* and *rewarder*; relations that give riſe to noble ſentiments and important duties, and confined their views to his ſupreme *beauty*, *excellence*, and *perfection*.

duct of Fenelon on this occaſion was very remarkable. He declared publicly his entire acquieſcence in the ſentence by which his book had been condemned, and not only read that ſentence to his people in the pulpit at *Cambray*, but exhorted them to reſpect and obey the papal decree [r]. This ſtep was differently interpreted by different perſons, according to their notions of this great man, or their reſpective ways of thinking. Some conſidered it as an inſtance of true magnanimity, as the mark of a meek and gentle ſpirit, that preferred the peace of the church to every private view of intereſt or glory. Others, leſs charitable, looked upon this ſubmiſſive conduct as ignoble and puſillanimous, as denoting manifeſtly a want of integrity, inaſmuch as it ſuppoſed, that the prelate in queſtion condemned with his lips what in his heart he believed to be true. One thing indeed ſeems generally agreed on, and that is, that Fenelon perſiſted, to the end of his days, in the ſentiments which, in obedience to the order of the pope, he retracted and condemned in a public manner.

La Peyrere, White, Sfondrati, and Borri.

LII. Beſides theſe controverſies, which derived their importance chiefly from the influence and reputation of the diſputants, and thus became productive of great tumults and diviſions in the church, there were others excited by ſeveral innovators, whoſe new and ſingular opinions were followed with troubles, though of a leſs momentous and permanent nature. Such was the ſtrange doctrine of ISAAC LA PEYRERE, who, in two ſmall treatiſes, publiſhed in the year 1655, maintained, that it is the origin of the Jewiſh nation, and not of the human race, that we find recorded in the books of MOSES, and that our globe was inhabited by many nations before ADAM, whom he conſidered as the father of the Jews. Though PEYRERE was a proteſtant when he publiſhed this opinion, yet the doctors of the Romiſh church looked upon themſelves as obliged to puniſh an error that ſeemed to ſtrike at the foundation of all Revealed Religion; and therefore, in the year 1656, had him ſeized at *Bruſſels*, and caſt into priſon, where, to eſcape the flames, he publicly renounced his erroneous ſyſtem, and, to make a full expiation for it, embraced the popiſh religion [s].

---

[r] An ample and impartial account of this controverſy has been given by Toussaints du Plessis, a Benedictine, in his *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe de* Meaux, livr. v. tom. i. p. 485—523. —Ramsay, in his *Life of* Fenelon, written in French, and publiſhed at the *Hague* in the year 1723, is leſs impartial; but is nevertheleſs worthy of being conſulted on this ſubject. See Voltaire, *Siécle de* Louis XIV., tom. ii. p. 301.—The public acts and edicts relating to this controverſy have been collected by Du Plessis Argentre, in his *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 402.

THOMAS WHITE, known at different times, and in different countries, by the names of ALBIUS, ANGLUS, CANDIDUS, BIANCHI [t], which he aſſumed ſucceſſively, made a conſiderable figure, about the middle of this century, in *England*, *Portugal*, *France*, and the *Netherlands*, by the number and ſubtilty of his philoſophical productions; but he alſo incurred the diſpleaſure of many of the doctors of his communion, on account of the novelty and ſingularity of his opinions. He was undoubtedly a man of genius and penetration; but, being a paſſionate admirer

---

[s] BAYLE's *Dictionary* at the article PEYRERE.—ARNOLDI *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. et Hæret.* tom. iii. p. 70.—*Menagiana*, publiſhed by DE LA MONNOYE, tom. ii. p. 40.

☞ [t] All theſe denominations were relative to his true name, which was WHITE. This man was a peculiar favourite of Sir KENELM DIGBY's, and mentions him with ſingular veneration in his philoſophical writings. See more of this WHITE in WOOD's *Athenæ Oxon.* 2d edit. vol. ii. p. 665, and in the *Biograph. Brit.* Article GLANVIL, vol. iv. p. 2206.

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I.

of the Peripatetic philoſophy, he ventured to employ it in the explication of ſome of the peculiar doctrines of the Romiſh church. This bold attempt led him imperceptibly out of the beaten road of popery, opened to him new views of things, and made him adopt notions that had never been heard of in the church of *Rome*; and hence his books were prohibited and condemned in ſeveral places, and particularly at *Rome* by the *Congregation of the Index*. This innovator is ſaid to have died in *England*, his native country, and to have left a ſect behind him that embraced his doctrine, but, in proceſs of time, fell into oblivion [u].

His peculiarities, however, were nothing, in compariſon with the romantic notions of JOSEPH FRANCIS BORRI, a Milaneſe knight, eminent for his knowledge of chymiſtry and phyſic; but who, at the ſame time, appears to have been rather a madman than a heretic. The fancies broached by this man, concerning the VIRGIN MARY, the HOLY GHOST, the erection of a new celeſtial kingdom, of which he himſelf was to be the founder, and the downfal of the Roman pontif, are ſo extravagant, childiſh, and abſurd, that no ſober perſon can view them in any other light than as the crude reveries of a diſordered brain. Beſides, the conduct of this fanatic, in ſeveral places, diſcovered the greateſt vanity and levity, attended with that ſpirit of impoſture that is uſually viſible in quacks and mountebanks; and, indeed, in the whole of his behaviour, he ſeemed deſtitute of ſenſe, integrity, and prudence. The inquiſitors had ſpread their ſnares for BORRI, but he luckily eſcaped them, and wandered up and down through a great part of *Europe*, giving himſelf out for another ESCULAPIUS, and pretending to be initiated into the moſt profound myſteries of chemical ſcience. But in the year 1672, he imprudently fell into the clutches of the Roman pontif, who pronounced againſt him a ſentence of perpetual impriſonment [w].

---

[u] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the Article ANGLUS.— BAILLET, *Vie de* DES CARTES, tom. ii. p. 245.

The laſt innovator we ſhall here mention is COELESTINE SFONDRATI, who, having formed the deſign of terminating the diſputes concerning predeſtination, by new explications of that doctrine, wrote a book upon that knotty ſubject, which threw into combuſtion, in the year 1696, a conſiderable part of the Romiſh church; ſince it was, in ſome things, agreeable to none of the contending parties, and neither ſatisfied entirely the Jeſuits nor their adverſaries. Five French biſhops, of great credit at the court of *Rome*, accuſed the author, notwithſtanding the high rank of cardinal to which he had been raiſed on account of his extenſive learning, of various errors, and more eſpecially of having departed from the ſentiments and doctrine of AUGUSTINE. This accuſation was brought before INNOCENT XII., in the year 1696, but the conteſt it ſeemed adapted to excite was nipt in the bud. The pontif appeaſed, or rather put off, the French prelates, with a fair promiſe that he would appoint a congregation to examine the cardinal's doctrine, and then pronounce ſentence accordingly; but he forgot his promiſe, imitated the prudent conduct of his predeceſſors on like occaſions, and did not venture to give a final deciſion to this intricate and knotty controverſy [x].

LIII. There

---

[w] There is a very intereſting article in BAYLE's *Dictionary* relating to BORRI, in which all the extravagancies of that wrong-headed man are curiouſly related. See alſo ARNOLD, *loc. cit.* p. iii. c. xviii. p. 193.

[x] This book, which was publiſhed at *Rome* in 4to, in the year

Canonizations.

LIII. There was ſcarcely any change introduced into the ritual of the Romiſh church during this century, if we except an edict of URBAN VIII., for diminiſhing the number of holidays, which was iſſued out in the year 1643 [y]; we ſhall therefore conclude this account with a liſt of the ſaints added to the Kalendar by the Roman pontifs during the period now before us.

In the year 1601, CLEMENT VIII. raiſed to that ſpiritual dignity RAYMOND of PENNAFORT, the famous compiler of the *Decretals*; in 1608, FRANCES PONTIANI, a Benedictine nun; and, in 1610, the eminent and illuſtrious CHARLES BORROMEO, biſhop of *Milan*, ſo juſtly celebrated for his exemplary piety, and almoſt unparalleled liberality and beneficence.

GREGORY XV. conferred, in the year 1622, the honour of ſaintſhip on THERESIA, a native of *Avila* in *Spain*, and a nun of the Carmelite Order.

URBAN VIII., in the year 1623, conferred the ſame ghoſtly honours on PHILIP NERI, the founder

---

year 1696, is entitled, *Nodus Prædeſtinationis diſſolutus.*—The Letters of the French biſhops, with the anſwer of the Roman pontif, are to be found in DU PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE's *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 394. and NATALIS ALEXANDER's *Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis*, p. 877. The Letters of the biſhops are remarkable in this reſpect, that they contain ſharp animadverſions againſt the Jeſuits and their diſcipline. The prelates expreſs, in the ſtrongeſt terms, their abhorrence of the doctrine of *philoſophical ſin*, which has rendered the Jeſuits ſo deſervedly infamous, and their deteſtation of the methods of propagating Chriſtianity employed by the miſſionaries of that Order in *China*. Nay, to expreſs their averſion to the doctrine of SFONDRATI, they ſay, that his opinions are *ſtill* more *erroneous* and *pernicious* than *even* thoſe of the *Moliniſts*. The doctrine of this cardinal has been accurately repreſented and compared with that of AUGUSTIN by the learned BASNAGE, in his *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, livr. xii. c. iii. § xi. p. 713.

[y] The bull iſſued out by URBAN VIII., for diminiſhing the number of the holidays celebrated in the church of *Rome*, may be ſeen in the *Nouvelle Bibliotheque*, tom. xv. p. 88.

of the Order entitled, *Fathers of the Oratory*, in *Italy*; on IGNATIUS LOYOLA, the parent of the Jeſuits; and on his chief diſciple FRANCIS XAVIER, the Jeſuitical *Apoſtle of the Indians*.

ALEXANDER VII. canonized, in the year 1658, THOMAS DE VILLANOVA, a Spaniſh monk, of the Order of *St. Auguſtin*; and, in 1665, FRANCIS DE SALES, biſhop of *Geneva*.

CLEMENT X. added to this ghoſtly liſt, in the year 1670, PEDRO DE ALCANTARA, a Franciſcan monk; and MARIA MAGDALENA PACTII, a Florentine nun of the Carmelite Order; and, in the year 1671, ROSE, an American Virgin, of the third Order of Dominic, and LEWIS BERTRAND, a Dominican monk.

Under the pontificate of INNOCENT XII., ſaintſhip was conferred upon CAJETAN of *Vicenza*, a regular clerk of the Order of Theatins, for whom that honour had been deſigned twenty years before, by CLEMENT X., who died at the time the canonization was to have been performed; JOHN of *Leon*, a Hermit of *St. Auguſtin*; PASCHAL BAYLONIOS, a Franciſcan monk of the kingdom of *Arragon*; and JOHN DE DIEU, a Portugueſe, and one of the Order of the *Brethren of Hoſpitality*, all of whom had been marked for a place in the Kalendar, by ALEXANDER VIII., were ſolemnly canonized, in the year 1691, by INNOCENT XII. [z].

---

[z] The *Diplomas* of the pontifs, relative to all theſe canonizations, may be ſeen in JUSTUS FONTANINUS's *Codex Conſtitutionum, quas ſummi Pontifices ediderunt in ſolemni Canonizatione ſanctorum*, p. 260. publiſhed *in folio* at *Rome*, in the year 1729. As they contain the particular reaſons which occaſioned the elevation of theſe perſons to a place in the Kalendar, and the peculiar kind of merit on which each of theſe ghoſtly promotions was founded, they offer abundant matter for reflection and cenſure to a judicious reader. Nor would it be labour ill employed to inquire, without prejudice or partiality, into the juſtice, piety, and truth of what the popes allege in theſe *Diplomas*, as the reaſons inducing them to confer ſaintſhip on the perſons therein mentioned.

CHAP. II.

The HISTORY *of the* GREEK *and* ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I.

The ſtate of the Greek Church.

I. THE hiſtory of the Greek and Eaſtern Chriſtians, faithfully and accurately compoſed, would, no doubt, furniſh us with a variety of entertaining and uſeful records; but the events that happen, and the tranſactions that are carried on in theſe diſtant regions, are very rarely tranſmitted to us genuine and uncorrupted. The ſpirit of religious party, and the pious frauds it often engenders, want of proper information, and undiſtinguiſhing credulity, have introduced a fabulous mixture into the accounts we have of the ſtate of the Chriſtian religion in the Eaſt; and this conſideration has engaged us to treat in a more conciſe manner, than would otherwiſe have been expedient, this particular branch of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory.

The Greek church, whoſe wretched ſituation was mentioned in the hiſtory of the preceding century, continued, during the preſent one, in the ſame deplorable ſtate of ignorance and decay, deſtitute of the means of acquiring or promoting ſolid and uſeful knowledge. This account is, however, to be conſidered as taken from a general view of that church; for ſeveral of its members may be alleged as exceptions from this general character of ignorance, ſuperſtition, and corruption. Among that multitude of Greeks who travel into *Sicily*, *Venice*, *Rome*, *England*, *Holland*, and *Germany*, or carry on trade in their own country, or fill honourable and important poſts in the court of the Turkiſh emperor, there are undoubtedly ſeveral, who are exempt from this reproach of ignorance and ſtupidity, of ſuperſtition and profligacy, and who make a figure by their opulence and credit [*a*]. But nothing can be more rooted and invincible than the averſion the Greeks in general diſcover to the Latin or Romiſh church; an averſion which neither promiſes nor threatenings, artifice nor violence, have been able to conquer, or even to temper or diminiſh, and which has continued inflexible and unrelenting amidſt the moſt zealous efforts of the Roman pontifs, and the various means employed by their numerous miſſionaries to gain over this people to their communion and juriſdiction [*b*].

[*a*] I have been led to theſe remarks by the complaints of ALEXANDER HELLADIUS, and others, who ſee things in the light in which he has placed them. There is ſtill extant a book publiſhed in Latin by this author, in the year 1714, entitled, *The preſent ſtate of the Greek Church*, in which he throws out the bittereſt reproaches upon ſeveral authors of eminent merit and learning, who have given accounts of that church, and maintains that his brethren of the Greek communion are much more pious, learned, wiſe, and opulent, than they are commonly ſuppoſed to be. Inſtead of envying the Greeks the merit and felicity which this panegyriſt ſuppoſes them poſſeſſed of, we ſincerely wiſh them much greater degrees of both. But we obſerve, at the ſame time, that, from the very accounts given by HELLADIUS, it would be eaſy to prove, that the ſtate of the Greeks is not a whit better than it is generally ſuppoſed to be; though it may be granted, that the ſame ignorance, ſuperſtition, and immorality, do not abound alike in all places, nor among all perſons. See what we have remarked on this ſubject in the accounts we have given of the Eaſtern church during the ſixteenth century.

[*b*] The Jeſuit TARILLON has given an ample relation of the numerous *Miſſions* in *Greece* and the other provinces of the Ottoman empire, and of the preſent ſtate of theſe Miſſions, in his Letter to PONTCHARTRAINE, *Sur l'état préſent des Miſſions des Pères Jéſuites dans la Grece*, which is publiſhed in the *Nouveaux Memoires des Miſſions de la Campagnie de Jeſus*, tom. i. p. 1125. For an account of the ſtate of the Romiſh religion in the iſlands of the *Archipelago*, ſee the letter of the Jeſuit XAVIER PORTIER, in the *Lettres edifiantes et curieuſes écrites des Miſſions étrangeres*, tom. x. p. 328. Theſe accounts are, it is true, ſomewhat embelliſhed, in order to advance the glory of the Jeſuits: but the exaggerations of theſe miſſionaries may be eaſily corrected by the ac-

It is true, indeed, that the Latin doctors have founded churches in ſome of the iſlands of the *Archipelago;* but theſe congregations are poor and inconſiderable; nor will either the Greeks or their maſters, the Turks, permit the Romiſh miſſionaries to extend further their ſpiritual juriſdiction.

The ſtory of Cyrillus Lucar.

II. Under the pontificate of URBAN VIII., great hopes were entertained of ſoftening the antipathy of the Greeks againſt the Latin church [c], and of engaging them, and the other Chriſtians of the Eaſt, to embrace the communion of *Rome*, and acknowledge the ſupremacy and juriſdiction of its pontif. This was the chief object that excited the ambitious zeal and employed the aſſiduous labour and activity of URBAN, who called to his aſſiſtance ſuch eccleſiaſtics as were moſt eminent for their acquaintance with Greek and Oriental learning, and with the tempers, manners, and characters of the Chriſtians in thoſe diſtant regions, that they might ſuggeſt the ſhorteſt and moſt effectual method of bringing them and their churches under the Roman yoke. The

The hopes of an union between the Greek and Latin churches entirely diſpelled.

---

counts of other writers, who, in our times, have treated this branch of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory. See, above all others, R. SIMON's (under the fictitious name of SANIOSE) *Bibliotheque Critique*, tom. i. c. xxiii. p. 340. and eſpecially p. 346. where the author confirms a remarkable fact, which we have mentioned above upon the authority of URBAN CERRI, *viz.* that amidſt the general diſlike which the Greeks have of the Romiſh church, none carry this diſlike to ſuch a high degree of antipathy and averſion, as thoſe very Greeks who have been educated at *Rome*, or in the other ſchools and ſeminaries belonging to its ſpiritual juriſdiction. *Ils ſont* (ſays Father SIMON) *les premiers à crier contre et à medire du Pape et des Latins. Ces Pelerins Orientaux qui viennent chez nous fourbent et abuſent de notre credulité pour acheter un benefice et tourmenter les miſſionaires Latins*, &c. We have ſtill more recent and ample teſtimonies of the invincible hatred of the Greeks towards the Latins, in the *Preface* to COWELL's *Account of the preſent Greek Church*, printed at *Cambridge*, in the year 1723.

[c] See the Life of MORINUS, which is prefixed to his *Antiquitates Eccleſ. Orient.* p. 37.

wiſeſt of theſe counſellors adviſed the pontif to lay it down for a preliminary in this difficult negociation, that the Greek and Eaſtern Chriſtians were to be indulged in almoſt every point that had hitherto been refuſed them by the Romiſh miſſionaries, and that no alteration was to be introduced either into their ritual or doctrine; that their ceremonies were to be tolerated, ſince they did not concern the eſſence of religion; and that their doctrine was to be explained and underſtood in ſuch a manner, as might give it a near and ſtriking reſemblance of the doctrine and inſtitutions of the church of *Rome*. In defence of this method of proceeding, it was judiciouſly obſerved, that the Greeks would be much more tractable and obſequious, were they told by the miſſionaries, that it was not meant to convert them; that they had always been Roman-catholics in reality, though not in profeſſion; and that the popes had no intention of perſuading them to abandon the doctrine of their anceſtors, but only deſired that they would underſtand it in its true and genuine ſenſe. This plan gave riſe to a variety of laborious productions, in which there was more learning than probity, and more dexterity than candour and good faith. Such were the treatiſes publiſhed by LEO ALLATIUS, MORINUS, CLEMENT GALANUS, LUCAS HOLSTENIUS, ABRAHAM ECHELLENSIS [d], and others, who pretended ed to demonſtrate, that there was little or no difference between the religion of the Greeks, Armenians, and Neſtorians, and that of the church of *Rome*, a few ceremonies excepted, together with ſome unuſual phraſes and terms that are peculiar to the Chriſtians of the Eaſt.

---

[d] The book of LEO ALLATIUS, *De Concordia Eccleſiæ Orientalis & Occidentalis*, is well known, and deſervedly looked upon, by the moſt learned men among the Proteſtants, as the work of a diſingenuous and inſidious writer. The *Græcia Orthodoxa* of the ſame author, which was publiſhed at *Rome* in the year 1652, in 4to, and contains a compilation from all the books of the Grecian doctors that were well affected to the Latin church, is ſtill extant.—We have nothing of LUCAS HOLSTENIUS (who was ſuperior to ALLATIUS in learning and ſagacity) upon this ſubject, except two poſthumous diſſertations,

This deſign of bringing, by artful compliances, the Greek and Eaſtern churches under the juriſdiction of *Rome* was oppoſed by many; but by none with more reſolution and zeal than by CYRILLUS LUCAR, patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, a man of extenſive learning and knowledge of the world, who had travelled through a great part of *Europe*, and was well acquainted with the doctrine and diſcipline both of the Proteſtant and Romiſh churches. This prelate declared openly, and indeed with more courage than prudence, that he had a ſtrong propenſity to the religious ſentiments of the Engliſh and Dutch churches, and had conceived the deſign of reforming the doctrine and ritual of the Greeks, and bringing them nearer to the purity and ſimplicity of the Goſpel. This was ſufficient to render the venerable patriarch odious to the friends of *Rome*. And accordingly the Jeſuits, ſeconded

---

ſertations, *De miniſtro et forma ſacramenti confirmationis apud Græcos*, which were publiſhed at *Rome* in the year 1666.—The treatiſes of MORINUS, *De pœnitentia et ordinationibus*, are known to all the learned, and ſeem expreſsly compoſed to make the world believe, that there is a ſtriking uniformity of ſentiment between the Greek and Latin churches on theſe two important points, when, laying aſide the difference that ſcholaſtic terms and peculiar modes of expreſſion may appear to occaſion, we attend to the meaning that is annexed to theſe terms by the members of the two communions.—GALANUS, in a long and laborious work, publiſhed at *Rome* in the year 1650, has endeavoured to prove, that the Armenians differ very little from the Latins in their religious opinions; and ABRAHAM ECHELLENSIS has attempted to convince us in ſeveral treatiſes (and more eſpecially in his *Animadverſiones ad Hebed. Jeſu Catalogum librorum Chaldaicorum*), that all Chriſtians throughout *Africa* and *Aſia* have the ſame ſyſtem of doctrine that is received among the Latins, by the credit and influence of the French ambaſſador, and aſſiſted by the treacherous ſtratagems of ſome perfidious Greeks, continued to perplex and perſecute the good man in various ways, and at length accompliſhed his ruin; for, by the help of falſe witneſſes, they obtained an accuſation of treaſon againſt him; in conſequence of which he was put to death, in the year 1638, by the order of the Emperor [e]. He was ſucceeded by Cyrillus, Biſhop of *Berea*, a man of a dark, malignant, and violent ſpirit, and the infamous inſtrument the Jeſuits had chiefly employed in bringing him to an untimely end. As this new patriarch declared himſelf openly in favour of the Latins, the reconciliation of the Greeks with the church of *Rome* ſeemed more probable than ever, nay almoſt certain [f]; but the diſmal fate of this

---

[e] The *Confeſſion of Faith*, drawn up by Cyrillus Lucar, was publiſhed in *Holland* in the year 1645; and is alſo inſerted by Aymon, in his *Monumens authentiques de la Religion des Grecs*, p. 237. By this confeſſion, it appears evidently, that Cyrillus had a ſtronger inclination towards the doctrine of the reformed churches, than to that which was commonly received among the Greeks. Nor was he, by any means, ill-affected towards the Lutherans, ſince he addreſſed ſeveral letters to the Swediſh clergy about this time, and ſolicited their friendſhip, as appears from the learned Arkenholtz's *Memoires de la Reine* Christine, tom. i. p. 486. tom. ii. Append. p. 113.—Aymon has publiſhed, in the work already mentioned, p. 1—109. twenty-ſeven Letters of this Patriarch to the Clergy of *Geneva*, and to other Doctors of the Reformed Church, in which his religious ſentiments are ſtill more plainly diſcovered. His life, tranſactions, and deplorable fate, have been recorded by Thomas Smith, a learned divine of the Engliſh Church, in his *Narratio de Vitâ, Studiis, Geſtis, et Martyrio* Cyrilli Lucaris, which is the third article of his *Miſcellanea*, publiſhed at *London* in 8vo, in the year 1686; as alſo by Hottinger, in his *Analect. Hiſtorico-Theolog. Appendic.* diſſert. viii. p. 550. and by other authors mentioned by Fabricius in his *Bibliotheca Græca*, vol. x. p. 499.

[f] See Eliæ Vegelii *Defenſio Exerc. de Eccleſiâ Græcâ*, p. 300. where we find the letters of the Roman pontif Urban VIII. to Cyrillus of *Berea*, in which he loads with applauſe

this unworthy prelate diſpelled all of a ſudden the pleaſing hopes and the anxious fears with which *Rome* and its adverſaries beheld the approach of this important event. The ſame violent death that had concluded the days of CYRILLUS LUCAR purſued his ſucceſſor, in whoſe place PARTHENIUS, a zealous oppoſer of the doctrine and ambitious pretenſions of *Rome*, was raiſed to the patriarchal dignity. After this period, the Roman pontifs deſiſted from their attempts upon the Greek church, no favourable opportunity being offered either of depoſing its patriarchs, or gaining them over to the Romiſh communion.

Whether or not the Romiſh doctors and miſſionaries contributed to the corruption of the doctrine of the Greek church.

III. Notwithſtanding theſe unſucceſsful attempts of the Roman pontifs to reduce the Greek church under their dominion, many allege, and more eſpecially the reformed clergy complain, that the doctrine of that church has been manifeſtly corrupted by the emiſſaries of *Rome*. It is ſuppoſed, that, in later times, the munificence of the French ambaſſadors at the *Port*, and the perſuaſive ſophiſtry of the Jeſuits, have made ſuch irreſiſtible impreſſions on the avarice and ignorance of the Greek biſhops, whoſe poverty is great, that they have departed, in ſeveral points, from the religious ſyſtem of their anceſtors, and have adopted, among other errors of the Romiſh church, the monſtrous and unnatural doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*. This change is ſaid to have been more eſpecially brought about in the famous council, which was aſſembled, in the year 1672,

---

this new patriarch, for having been ſo inſtrumental in baniſhing from among the Greeks the pernicious errors of CYRILLUS LUCAR, and warmly exhorts him to depoſe all the Greek patriarchs and biſhops that are not favourable to the Latin Church. Theſe exhortations are ſeconded by flattering promiſes, and, particularly, by an aſſurance of protection and ſuccour from the King of *Spain*. CYRILLUS of *Berea* died in the communion of the Romiſh Church. See HEN. HILLARII *Not. ad* PHIL. CYPRII *Chron. Eccleſiæ Græcæ*, p. 470.

1672, at *Jeruſalem*, by DOSITHEUS, the patriarch of that city [g]. Without entering into an examination of the truth and equity of this charge brought againſt the Greek biſhops, we ſhall only obſerve, that it was the controverſy between the Roman Catholics and Proteſtants in *France* that firſt gave riſe to it. The latter, and more eſpecially JOHN CLAUDE, ſo juſtly celebrated for his extenſive learning and maſterly eloquence, maintained, that many of the doctrines of the Romiſh church, and more particularly that of *Tranſubſtantiation*, were of a modern date, and had never been heard of before the ninth century. The Roman Catholics, on the contrary, with ARNAUD at their head, affirmed, that the doctrine of *Rome* concerning the *Euchariſt*, and the *real* converſion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of CHRIST in that holy ordinance, had been received by Chriſtians in all ages of the church [h]. To ſtrengthen their cauſe further by authorities, that they imagined would have no ſmall influence upon their adverſaries, they ventured to aſſert, that this doctrine was adopted by all the Eaſtern Chriſtians, and particularly by the Greek churches [i].

---

[g] See, for an account of this council, AYMON, *Memoires Authentiques de la Religion des Grecs*, tom. i. p. 263.—GISBERTI CUPERI *Epiſtolæ*, p. 404. 407.—See, more eſpecially, the judicious and learned obſervations of BASNAGE on the tranſactions of this council, in his *Hiſtoire de la Religion des Egliſes Reformées*, period iv. p. 1. c. xxxii. p. 452. and COWELL's *Account of the Preſent State of the Greek Church*, book i. ch. v. p. 136.

☞ [h] It was to prove this moſt groundleſs aſſertion, that the famous NICOLLE, publiſhed his artful book, *De la Perpétuité de la Foi*, in the year 1664, which was anſwered, with a victorious force of evidence, by the learned CLAUDE.

[i] The names and productions of the principal writers that appeared in this controverſy, may be found in the *Bibliotheca Græca* of FABRICIUS, vol. x. p. 444. and in the learned PFAFF's *Diſſertatio contr.* LUDOV. LOGERII *Opus Euchariſticum*, publiſhed at *Tubingen* in the year 1718.

This bold aſſertion required ſtriking and authentic teſtimonies to give it any degree of credit. Accordingly the ambaſſador of *France*, reſiding at *Conſtantinople*, received orders from his court to concur with the Jeſuits, and to leave no methods unemployed in procuring certificates from the Greek clergy to confirm this aſſertion. On the other hand, the Engliſh and Dutch ambaſſadors, perſuaded that no ſuch doctrine was really profeſſed in the Greek church, procured alſo the teſtimonies of ſeveral eccleſiaſtics, in order to take from the Roman Catholic diſputants this pretext; which, after all, was of no great conſequence, as it did not affect the merits of the cauſe. The reſult, however, of this ſcrutiny was favourable to the Romiſh doctors, whoſe agents in foreign parts procured a more numerous liſt of teſtimonies than their adverſaries could produce. The Proteſtants invalidated theſe teſtimonies, by proving fully, that many of them were obtained by bribery from the indigent Greeks, whoſe deplorable poverty made them ſacrifice truth to lucre; and that a great number of them were drawn by artifice from ignorant prieſts, whom the Jeſuits deceived, by diſguiſing the doctrines of *Rome* in ſuch a manner as to give them a Grecian air, and make them reſemble the religious ſyſtem of the Eaſtern churches [*k*]. Granting all this to be true, it may nevertheleſs be juſtly queſtioned, whether the admiſſion of certain doctrines in the Greek church, that reſembled the errors of Popery, is to be dated from the period now before us; and whoever

---

[*k*] Here, above all other hiſtories, the reader will do well to conſult COWELL's *Account of the Preſent State of the Greek Church*, Pref. p. 2. and alſo book i. ch. v. p. 136. as this author was actually at *Conſtantinople* when this ſcene of fraud and bribery was carried on, and was an eye-witneſs of the inſidious arts and perfidious practices employed by the Jeſuits to obtain from the Greek prieſts and monks teſtimonies in favour of the doctrine of the Latin or Romiſh church.

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I.

whoever examines this controverſy with a ſpirit of impartiality, accompanied with a competent knowledge of the hiſtory of the religious doctrine of the Greek churches, will perhaps find, that a certain vague and obſcure notion, ſimilar to the Romiſh doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, has been received during many ages by ſeveral of theſe churches; though, in theſe latter times, they may have learnt, from the Romiſh miſſionaries, the Popiſh manner of expreſſing this monſtrous and unaccountable tenet [*l*].

The Ruſſian church.

IV. Of thoſe independent Greek churches, which are governed by their own laws, and are not ſubject to the juriſdiction of the patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, there is none but the church eſtabliſhed in *Ruſſia* that can furniſh any matter for an eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian; the reſt are ſunk in the moſt deplorable ignorance and barbarity that can poſſibly be imagined. About the year 1666, a certain ſect, which aſſumed the name of *Iſbraniki*, i. e. *the Multitude of the Elect*, but were called by their adverſaries, *Roſkolſnika*, or the *ſeditious Faction*, aroſe in *Ruſſia*, and excited conſiderable tumults and commotions in that kingdom [*m*]. The reaſons that this ſect alleges in defence of its ſeparation from the Ruſſian church, are not as yet known with any degree of certainty; nor have we any ſatisfactory or accurate account of its doctrines and inſtitutions [*n*]; we only know, in general,

---

[*l*] The learned LA CROZE, who cannot be ſuſpected of any propenſity to favour the cauſe of *Rome* in general, or that of the Jeſuits in particular, was of opinion, that the Greeks had been long in poſſeſſion of the fooliſh doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*. See GISBERTI CUPERI *Epiſtol.* p. 37. 44. 48. 51, 65.

[*m*] Theſe, perhaps, are the ſame perſons of whom the learned GMELIN ſpeaks, under the denomination of STEROWERZI, in the account of his *Voyage into Siberia*, tom. iv. p. 404.

☞ [*n*] This ſect is called by other authors the ſect of the *Roſkolniki*. According to the account of VOLTAIRE, who pretends neral, that its members affect an extraordinary air of piety and devotion, and complain of the corruptions introduced into the ancient religion of the Ruſſians, partly by the negligence, and partly by the ambition, of the Epiſcopal Order [o]. On the other hand, great pains were taken to conquer the obſtinacy of this factious ſect; arguments, promiſes, threatenings, dragoonings, the authority of ſynods and councils, ſeconded by racks and gibbets; in a word, all the methods

---

pretends to have drawn the materials of his *Hiſtory of the Ruſſian Empire under* PETER I., from authentic records furniſhed by the court of *Peterſburg*, this ſect made its firſt appearance in the twelfth century. The members of it allege, in defence of their ſeparation, the corruptions, both in doctrine and diſcipline, that have been introduced into the Ruſſian Church. They profeſs a rigorous zeal for the *Letter* of Holy Scripture, which they do not underſtand; and the tranſpoſition of a ſingle word in a new edition of the Ruſſian Bible, though this tranſpoſition was made to correct an uncouth phraſe in the tranſlation commonly received, threw them into the greateſt combuſtion and tumult. They will not allow a prieſt to adminiſter baptiſm after having taſted ſpirituous liquor; and in this, perhaps, they do not amiſs, ſince it is well known, that the Ruſſian prieſts ſeldom touch the flaſk without drinking deep. They hold, that there is no ſubordination of rank, no ſuperior or inferior, among the faithful; that a Chriſtian may kill himſelf for the love of CHRIST; that *Hallelujah* muſt be but twice pronounced; and that it is a great ſin to repeat it thrice; and that a prieſt muſt never give a bleſſing but with three fingers. They are regular, even to auſterity, in their manners; but as they have always refuſed to admit Chriſtians of other denominations into their religious aſſemblies, they have been ſuſpected of committing in them various abominations, which ought not to be believed without the ſtrongeſt and moſt demonſtrative proof. They are accuſed, for example, of killing a child in theſe aſſemblies, and of drinking its blood, and of laſcivious commerce in its moſt irregular forms.

[o] See BERGIUS, *De Statu Eccleſiæ Religionis Muſcoviticæ*, ſect. xi. cap. vii. p. 69. ſect. ii. cap. xvi., p. 218.—*Append.* 270.—HEINECCIUS's *Account of the Greek Church*, written in German, p. 30.—HAVEN's *Iter Ruſſicum*.—Some doctors conjecture, that theſe *Iſbraniki*, or *Roſkolniki*, are a branch deſcended from the ancient Bogomilians, of whom we have already given ſome account, cent. xii. part ii. chap. v. § ii.

that artifice or barbarity could ſuggeſt were practiſed to bring back theſe ſeditious heretics into the boſom of the church. But the effect of theſe violent meaſures by no means anſwered the expectations of the Ruſſian government; they exaſperated, inſtead of reclaiming, theſe ſchiſmatics, who retired into the woods and deſarts, and, as it often happens, were rendered more fierce and deſperate by the calamities and ſufferings in which they were involved. From the time that PETER the Great aſcended the throne of *Ruſſia*, and made ſuch remarkable changes in the form and adminiſtration both of its civil and eccleſiaſtical government, this faction has been treated with more humanity and mildneſs; but it is alleged, that theſe mild proceedings have by no means healed the ſchiſm; and that, on the contrary, the ROSKOLNIKI have gained ſtrength, and are become ſtill more obſtinate ſince the period now mentioned.

The change introduced into the Ruſſian church by Peter I.

V. It will not be improper here to give ſome account of this reformation of the church of *Ruſſia*, that was owing to the active zeal and wiſdom of PETER I.; for though this intereſting event belongs to the hiſtory of the following century, yet the ſcheme, by which it was brought about, was laid towards the concluſion of that now before us. This great prince made no change in the articles of faith received among the Ruſſians, and which contain the doctrine of the Greek church. But he took the utmoſt pains to have this doctrine explained in a manner conformable to the dictates of right reaſon and the ſpirit of the Goſpel; and he uſed the moſt effectual methods to deſtroy, on the one hand, the influence of that hideous ſuperſtition that ſat brooding over the whole nation; and, on the other, to diſpel the ignorance of the clergy, which was incredible, and that of the people, which would have ſurpaſſed it, had that been poſſible. Theſe were great and arduous undertakings; and the reformation, to which they pointed, was ſuch as ſeemed to require whole ages to accompliſh and bring to any tolerable degree of perfection. To accelerate the execution of this glorious plan, PETER I. became a zealous protector and patron of arts and ſciences. He encouraged, by various inſtances of munificence, men of learning and genius to ſettle in his dominions. He reformed the ſchools that were ſunk in ignorance and barbariſm, and erected new ſeminaries of learning. He endeavoured to excite in his ſubjects a deſire of emerging from their ignorance and brutality, and a taſte for knowledge and the uſeful arts. And, to crown all theſe noble attempts, he extinguiſhed the infernal ſpirit of perſecution; aboliſhed the penal laws againſt thoſe that differed merely in religious opinion from the eſtabliſhed church; and granted to Chriſtians of all denominations liberty of conſcience, and the privilege of performing divine worſhip in the manner preſcribed by their reſpective liturgies and inſtitutions. This liberty, however, was modified in ſuch a prudent manner, as to reſtrain and defeat any attempts that might be made by the Latins to promote the intereſts of Popery in *Ruſſia*, or to extend the juriſdiction of the Roman pontif beyond the chapels of that communion that were tolerated by law. For though Roman Catholics were allowed places for the celebration of divine worſhip, yet the Jeſuits were not permitted to exerciſe the functions of miſſionaries or public teachers in *Ruſſia*; and a particular charge was given to the council, to which belonged the cognizance of eccleſiaſtical affairs, to uſe their utmoſt care and vigilance to prevent the propagation of Romiſh tenets among the people.

Beſides all this, a notable change was now introduced into the manner of governing the church. The ſplendid dignity of patriarch, which approached too near the luſtre and prerogatives of majeſty, not to be offenſive to the emperor and burthenſome to the people, was ſuppreſſed, or rather aſſumed, by this ſpirited prince, who declared himſelf the ſupreme pontif and head of the Ruſſian church [p]. The functions of this high and important office were intruſted with a council aſſembled at *Peterſburg*, which was called the *Holy Synod*, and in which one of the *archbiſhops*, the moſt diſtinguiſhed by his integrity and prudence, was appointed as preſident. This honourable office was filled by the famous STEPHEN JAVORSCI, who compoſed a laborious work, in the Ruſſian language, againſt hereſy [q]. The other orders of the clergy continued in their reſpective rank and offices; but both their revenues and their authority were conſiderably diminiſhed. It was reſolved at firſt, in this general reformation, to aboliſh all monaſteries and convents, as prejudicial to the community, and unfriendly to population; but this reſolution was not put in execu-

---

☞ [p] This account is not perhaps entirely accurate. Dr. MOSHEIM ſeems to inſinuate, that PETER aſſumed, not only the *authority*, but alſo the *office* and *title* of patriarch or ſupreme pontif, and head of the church. This, however, was not the caſe; he retained the power without the title, as may be ſeen by the oath that every member of the ſynod he had eſtabliſhed was obliged to take, when he was appointed to that office. It was in conſequence of his authority, as *emperor*, that he claimed an abſolute authority in the church, and not from any ghoſtly character or denomination. The oath now mentioned ran thus: *I ſwear and promiſe to be a faithful and obedient ſubject and ſervant to my true and natural ſovereign, and to the auguſt ſucceſſors it ſhall pleaſe him to appoint, in conſequence of the indiſputable power he has to regulate the ſucceſſion to the crown. I acknowledge him as the ſupreme judge of this ſpiritual college*, &c. See VOLTAIRE's *Hiſtoire de l'Empire de Ruſſie ſous Pierre le Grand*, tom. i. p. 174.

[q] LEQUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 1295.

tion; on the contrary, the emperor himſelf erected a magnificent monaſtery in honour of ALEXANDER NEWSKY, whom the Ruſſians place in the liſt of their heroes [r].

The ſtate of the Monophyſites.

VI. A ſmall body of the *Monophyſites* in *Aſia* abandoned, for ſome time, the doctrine and inſtitutions of their anceſtors, and embraced the communion of *Rome*. This ſtep was entirely owing to the ſuggeſtions and intrigues of a perſon named ANDREW ACHIGIAN, who had been educated at *Rome*, where he imbibed the principles of Popery, and, having obtained the title and dignity of patriarch from the Roman pontif, aſſumed the denomination of IGNATIUS XXIV. [s]. After the death of this pretended patriarch, another uſurper, whoſe name was PETER, aſpired after the ſame dignity, and, taking the title of IGNATIUS XXV., placed himſelf in the patriarchal chair; but the lawful patriarch of the ſect had credit enough with the Turks to procure the depoſition and baniſhment of this pretender; and thus the ſmall congregation which acknowledged his juriſdiction was entirely diſperſed [t]. The African Monophyſites, and more eſpecially the *Copts*, notwithſtanding that poverty and ignorance which expoſed them to the ſeductions of ſophiſtry, and gain, ſtood firm in their principles, and made an obſtinate reſiſtance to the promiſes, preſents, and attempts, employed by the papal miſſionaries to bring them under the Roman yoke.—With reſpect to the *Abyſſinians*, we have mentioned already, in its proper place, the revolution by which they delivered themſelves from that tyrannical yoke, and reſumed the liberty they had ſo imprudently renounced. It is proper, however, to take notice here of the zeal diſcovered by the Lutherans, in their attempts to diſpel the ignorance and ſuperſtition of this people, and to bring them to the knowledge of a purer religion, and a more rational worſhip. It was with this pious deſign that the learned HEYLING, of *Lubec*, undertook a voyage into *Ethiopia* in the year 1634, where he reſided many years, and acquired ſuch a diſtinguiſhed place in the favour and eſteem of the emperor, that he was honoured with the high and important office of prime miniſter of that mighty empire. In this eminent ſtation, he gave many inſtances of his zeal both for the intereſts of religion and the public good; after which he ſet out for *Europe*, but never arrived there, nor is it known in what manner, or by what accident, he ended his days [u].

---

[r] Thoſe who are acquainted with either the Daniſh or German languages, will find ſeveral intereſting anecdotes relating to theſe changes in HAVEN's *Iter Ruſſicum*.

[s] From the fifteenth century downwards, all the patriarchs of the *Monophyſites* have taken the name of IGNATIUS, and that for no other reaſon than to ſhew that they are the lineal ſucceſſors of IGNATIUS, who was biſhop of *Antioch* in the firſt century, and of conſequence the lawful patriarchs of *Antioch*. A like reaſon induces the religious chief of the Maronites, who alſo lays claim to the ſame dignity, to aſſume the name of PETER; for St. PETER is ſaid to have governed the church of *Antioch* before IGNATIUS.

[t] JO. SIMON. ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orientalis, Clementino-Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 482. and his *Diſſert. de Monophyſitis*, § iii. p. 6, 7.

Several years after this, ERNEST, Duke of *Saxe-Gotha*, ſurnamed the *Pious*, on account of his eminent ſanctity and virtue, formed the reſolution of making a new attempt to ſpread the knowledge of the Goſpel, in its purity and ſimplicity, among the ignorant and ſuperſtitious Abyſſinians. This deſign was formed by the counſels and ſuggeſtions of the famous LUDOLPH, and was to have been executed by the miniſtry of Abbot GREGORY, an

---

[u] A very curious life of HEYLING was publiſhed in German by Dr. MICHAELIS at *Hall*, in 1724.—See alſo MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. i. p. 253.

Abyſſinian, who had reſided for ſome time in *Europe* [*w*]. The unhappy fate of this miſſionary, who periſhed in a ſhipwreck in the year 1657, did not totally diſcourage the prince from purſuing his purpoſe; for, in the year 1663, he entruſted the ſame pious and important commiſſion with JOHN MICHAEL WANSLEB, a native of *Erfurt*, to whom he gave the wiſeſt orders, and whom he charged particularly to leave no means unemployed that might contribute to give the Abyſſinian nation a favourable opinion of the Germans, as it was upon this baſis alone that the ſucceſs of the preſent enterprize could be built. WANSLEB, however, whoſe virtue was by no means equal to his abilities, inſtead of continuing his journey to *Abyſſinia*, remained ſeveral years in *Egypt*. On his return from thence into *Europe*, he began to entertain uneaſy apprehenſions of the account that would naturally be demanded both of his conduct, and of the manner in which he had employed the ſums of money he received for his Abyſſinian expedition. Theſe apprehenſions rendered him deſperate, becauſe they were attended with a conſciouſneſs of guilt. Hence, inſtead of returning into *Germany*, he went directly to *Rome*, where, in the year 1667, he embraced, at leaſt in outward profeſſion, the doctrine of that church, and entered into the Dominican Order [*x*]. Thus the pious deſigns of the beſt of princes failed in the execution. To them, however, we are indebted for the great light that has been thrown by the learned and laborious LUDOLPH on the hiſtory, doctrine, literature, and manners, of the Abyſſinians, which, before this period, were but very ſuperficially known in *Europe*.

[*w*] See LUDOLPHI *Proëmium ad Comm. in Hiſt. Æthiop.* p. 31.—JUNCKERI *Vita* JOBI LUDOLPHI, p. 68.

[*x*] For an account of this inconſtant and worthleſs, but learned man, ſee LOBO, *Voyage d'Abyſſ.* tom. i. p. 198. 227. 233. 248.—CYPRIAN. *Catalog. MSS. Biblioth. Gothanæ*, p. 64. EUS. RENAUDOT, *Pref. ad Hiſtor. Patriarch. Alexand.* ECHARD and QUETIF, *Scriptor. Ordin. Prædic.* tom. ii. p. 693. See the ſame authors, *Hiſtoria Eccleſiæ Alexandrinæ.*

The ſtate of the Armenians.

VII. The ſtate of the Chriſtians in *Armenia* underwent a conſiderable change ſoon after the commencement of this century, in conſequence of the incurſions of ABBAS *the Great*, King of *Perſia*, into that province. This prince laid waſte all that part of *Armenia* that lay contiguous to his dominions, and ordered the inhabitants to retire into *Perſia*. Theſe devaſtations were deſigned to prevent the Turks from approaching to his frontier; for the Eaſtern monarchs, inſtead of erecting fortified towns on the borders of their reſpective kingdoms, as is done by the European princes, laid waſte their borders upon the approach of the enemy, that, by thus cutting off the means of their ſubſiſtence, their progreſs might be either entirely ſtopped, or conſiderably retarded. In this general emigration, the more opulent and better ſort of the Armenians removed to *Iſpahan*, the capital of *Perſia*, where the generous monarch granted them a beautiful ſuburb for their reſidence, with the free exerciſe of their religion, under the juriſdiction of a biſhop or patriarch. Under the reign of this magnanimous prince, who cheriſhed his people with a paternal tenderneſs, theſe happy exiles enjoyed the ſweets of liberty and abundance; but after his death the ſcene changed, and they were involved in calamities of various kinds [y]. The ſtorm of perſecution that aroſe upon them ſhook their conſtancy; many of them apoſtatiſed to the Mahometan religion, ſo that it was juſtly to be feared that this branch of the Armenian church would gradually periſh. On the other hand, the ſtate of religion in that church derived conſiderable advantages from the ſettlement of a prodigious number of Armenians in different parts of *Europe* for the purpoſes of commerce. Theſe merchants, who had fixed their reſidence, during this century, at *London*, *Amſterdam*, *Marſeilles*, and *Venice* [z], were not unmindful of the intereſts of religion in their native country. And their ſituation furniſhed them with favourable opportunities of exerting their zeal in this good cauſe, and particularly of ſupplying their Aſiatic brethren with Armenian tranſlations of the Holy Scriptures, and of other theological books, from the European preſſes, eſpecially from thoſe of *England* and *Holland*. Theſe pious and inſtructive productions being diſperſed among the Armenians, who lived under the Perſian and Turkiſh governments, contributed, no doubt, to preſerve that illiterate and ſuperſtitious people from falling into the moſt conſummate and deplorable ignorance.

---

[y] See CHARDIN, *Voyages en Perſe*, tom. ii. p. 106.—GABRIEL DU CHINON, *Nouvelles Relations du Levant*, p. 206.

The ſtate of the Neſtorians.

VIII. The diviſions that reigned among the Neſtorians in the preceding century ſtill ſubſiſted; and all the methods that had been employed to heal them proved hitherto ineffectual. Some of the Neſtorian biſhops diſcovered a propenſity to accommodate matters with the church of *Rome*. ELIAS II., biſhop of *Moſul*, ſent two private embaſſies to the Pope, in the year 1607 and 1610, to ſolicit his friendſhip; and, in the letter he addreſſed upon that occaſion to PAUL IV., declared his deſire to bring about a reconciliation between the Neſtorians and the Latin church [*a*]. ELIAS III., though at firſt extremely averſe to the doctrine and inſtitution of that church, changed his ſentiments in this reſpect; and, in the year 1657, addreſſed a letter to the congregation *De propagandâ Fide*, in which he intimated his readineſs to join with the church of *Rome*, on condition that the Pope would allow the Neſtorians a place of public worſhip in that city, and would abſtain from all attempts to alter the doctrine or diſcipline of that ſect [*b*]. The Romiſh doctors could not but perceive that a reconciliation, founded on ſuch conditions as theſe, would be attended with no advantage to their church, and promiſed nothing that could flatter the ambition of their pontif. And accordingly we do not find that the propoſal above mentioned was accepted. It does not appear that the Neſtorians were received, at this time, into the communion of the Romiſh Church, or that the biſhops of *Moſul* were, after this period, at all ſolicitous about the friendſhip or good-will of the Roman pontif. The Neſtorian biſhops of *Ormus*, who ſucceſſively aſſume the name of SIMEON, propoſed alſo, more than once [*c*], plans of reconciliation with the church of *Rome*; and, with that view, ſent the Roman pontif a confeſſion of their faith, that gave a clear idea of their religious tenets and inſtitutions. But theſe propoſals were little attended to by the court of *Rome*, which was either owing to its diſlike of the doctrine of theſe Neſtorians [*d*], or to that contempt which their poverty and want of influence excited in the pontifs, whoſe ambition and avidity aimed at acquiſitions of more conſequence; for it is well known, that, ſince the year 1617, the biſhops of *Ormus* have been in a low and declining ſtate, both in point of opulence and credit, and are no longer in a condition to excite the envy of their brethren at *Moſul* [*e*]. The Romiſh miſſionaries gained over, nevertheleſs, to their communion, a handful of Neſtorians, whom they formed into a congregation or church, about the middle of this century. The biſhops or patriarchs of this little flock reſide in the city of *Amida*, or *Diarbeker*, and all aſſume the denomination of JOSEPH [*f*]. The Neſtorians, who inhabit the coaſts of *Malabar*, and are called the Chriſtians of St. THOMAS, ſuffered innumerable vexations, and the moſt grievous perſecution, from the Romiſh prieſts, and more eſpecially the Jeſuits, while theſe ſettlements were in the hands of the Portugueſe; but neither artifice nor violence could engage them to embrace the communion of *Rome* [*g*]. But when *Cochin* was taken by the Dutch, in the year 1663, and the Portugueſe were driven out of theſe quarters, the perſecuted Neſtorians reſumed their primitive liberty, and were reinſtated in the privilege of ſerving God without moleſtation, according to their conſciences. Theſe bleſſings they ſtill continue to enjoy; nor are ſuch of them as entered into the communion of *Rome* diſturbed by the Dutch, who are uſed to treat with toleration and indulgence all ſects who live peaceably with thoſe who differ from them in religious opinions and ceremonies.

---

[z] For an account of the *Armenians* who ſettled at *Marſeilles*, and of the books they took care to have printed in that city for the uſe of their brethren in foreign parts, ſee RICH. SIMON's *Lettres Choiſies*, tom. ii. p. 137.—The ſame author (tom. iv. p. 160.), and the learned JOHN JOACHIM SCHRODER, in a *Diſſertation* prefixed to his *Theſaurus Linguæ Armenicæ*, give an account of the Armenian Bible that was printed in *Holland*. The latter alſo takes notice of the other Armenian books that were publiſhed at *Venice*, *Lyons*, and *Amſterdam*, *loc. cit.* cap. ii. § xxv. p. 38.

[*a*] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 543. tom. ii. p. 457. tom. iii. p. i. p. 650.

[*b*] ASSEMANNI *loc. cit.* tom. iii. p. 2.

[*c*] In the years 1619 and 1653.

[*d*] ASSEMANNI *loc. cit.* tom. i. p. 531. tom. ii. p. 457. tom. iii. p. i. p. 622.

[*e*] PET. STROZZA, *Præf. ad librum de Chaldæorum dogmatibus.*

[*f*] See LEQUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. ii. p. 1078.

[*g*] LE CROZE *Hiſtoire du Chriſtianiſme des Indes*, livr. v. p. 344.

[*h*] SCHOUTEN *Voyage aux Indes Orient.* tom. i. p. 319. 446.

SECTION II.

PART II.

The HISTORY *of the* MODERN CHURCHES.

CHAP. I.

The HISTORY *of the* LUTHERAN CHURCH.

The Lutheran church loſes ground in ſome places.—The Heſſians embrace Calviniſm.

I. WE have already ſeen [a] the calamities and vexations the Lutheran church ſuffered from the perſecuting ſpirit of the Roman pontifs, and the intemperate zeal of the houſe of *Auſtria*, which, on many occaſions, ſhewed too great a propenſity to ſecond their ambitious and deſpotic meaſures; we ſhall therefore, at preſent, confine our view to the loſſes it ſuſtained from other quarters. The cauſe of Lutheraniſm ſuffered conſiderably by the deſertion of MAURICE, Landgrave of *Heſſe*, a prince of uncommon genius and learning, who not only embraced the doctrine and diſcipline of the *Reformed* church [b], but alſo, in the year 1604, removed the Lutheran profeſſors from their places in the Univerſity of *Marpurg*, and the doctors of that communion from the churches they had in his dominions. MAURICE, after taking this vigorous ſtep, on account of the obſtinacy with which the Lutheran clergy oppoſed his deſign, took particular care to have his ſubjects inſtructed in the doctrine of the Helvetic church, and introduced into the Heſſian churches the form of public worſhip that was obſerved at *Geneva*. This plan was not executed without ſome difficulty; but it acquired a complete degree of ſtability and conſiſtence in the year 1619, when deputies were ſent by this prince to the ſynod of *Dort*, in *Holland*, with expreſs orders to conſent, in the name of the Heſſian churches, to all the acts that ſhould be paſſed in that aſſembly. The doctors of the Reformed church, who lived at this period, defended ſtrenuouſly the meaſures followed by MAURICE, and maintained, that in all theſe tranſactions he obſerved the ſtricteſt principles of equity, and diſcovered an uncommon ſpirit of moderation. Perhaps the doctors of modern days may view this matter in a different point of light. They will acknowledge, perhaps, without heſitation, that if this illuſtrious prince had been more influenced by the ſentiments of the wiſeſt of the Reformed doctors, concerning the conduct we ought to obſerve towards thoſe who differ from us in religious matters, and leſs by his own will and humour, he would have ordered many things otherwiſe than he actually did [c].

---

[a] In the *Hiſtory of the Romiſh Church.*—See above.

☞ [b] The reader muſt always remember, that the writers of the continent generally uſe the denomination of *Reformed* in a limited ſenſe, to diſtinguiſh the church of *England* and the Calviniſtical churches from thoſe of the Lutheran perſuaſion.

The new reformation takes place in *Brandenburg*.

II. The example of the Landgrave of *Heſſe* was followed, in the year 1614, by JOHN SIGISMUND, elector of *Brandenburg*, who alſo renounced Lutheraniſm, and embraced the communion of the *Reformed* churches, though with certain reſtrictions, and without employing any acts of mere authority to engage his ſubjects in the ſame meaſure. For it is obſervable, that this prince did not adopt all the peculiar doctrines of Calviniſm. He introduced, indeed, into his dominions the form of public worſhip that was eſtabliſhed at *Geneva*, and he embraced the ſentiments of the Reformed churches concerning the *Perſon* of Christ, and the manner in which *he is preſent* in the eucharist, as they appeared to him much more conformable to reaſon and ſcripture than the doctrine of the Lutherans relating to theſe points. But, on the other hand, he refuſed to admit the Calviniſtical doctrine of *Divine Grace*, and *Abſolute Decrees*; and, on this account, neither ſent deputies to the ſynod of *Dort*, nor adopted the deciſions of that famous aſſembly on theſe intricate ſubjects. This way of thinking was ſo exactly followed by the ſucceſſors of Sigismund, that they never would allow the opinion of Calvin, concerning the *Divine Decrees*, to be conſidered as the public and received doctrine of the Reformed churches in their dominions. It muſt be particularly mentioned, to the honour of this wiſe prince, that he granted to his ſubjects an entire liberty in religious matters, and left it to their unreſtrained and free choice, whether they would remain in the profeſſion of Lutheraniſm, or follow the example of their ſovereign; nor did he exclude from civil honours and employments, or from the uſual marks of his protection and favour, thoſe who continued in the faith of their anceſtors. This lenity and moderation, which ſeemed ſo adapted to prevent jealouſy and envy, and to ſatisfy both parties, did not however produce this natural and ſalutary effect; nor were they ſufficient to reſtrain within the bounds of decency and charity ſeveral warm and inconſiderate votaries of Lutheraniſm. Theſe over-zealous perſons, who breathed the violent ſpirit of an age in which matters of conſequence were uſually carried on with vehemence and rigour, looked upon it as intolerable and highly provoking,—that the Lutherans and Calviniſts ſhould enjoy the ſame honours and prerogatives,—that all injurious terms and odious compariſons ſhould be baniſhed from religious debates—that the controverted points in theology ſhould either be entirely omitted in the ſermons and public diſcourſes of the clergy, or explained with a ſpirit of modeſty and Chriſtian charity,—that certain rites which diſpleaſed the Calviniſts ſhould be totally aboliſhed,—and that they who differed in opinions, ſhould be obliged to live in peace, concord, and the mutual exchange of good offices. If it was unreaſonable in them to be offended at injunctions of this nature, it was ſtill more ſo to diſcover their indignation, in a manner that excited not only ſharp and uncharitable debates, but alſo civil commotions and violent tumults, that diſturbed conſiderably the tranquillity of the ſtate, and nouriſhed a ſpirit of ſedition and revolt, which the labour of years was employed to extinguiſh in vain. In this troubled ſtate of things, the divines of *Saxony*, and more eſpecially thoſe of *Wittemberg*, undertook to defend the Lutheran cauſe; but if it be acknowledged, on the one hand, that their views were good, and their intentions upright; it muſt be owned, on the other, that their ſtyle was keen even to a degree of licentiouſneſs, and their zeal warm beyond all meaſure. And indeed, as it generally happens, their want of moderation hurt, inſtead of promoting, the cauſe in which they had embarked; for it was in conſequence of their violent proceedings, that the *Form of Concord* was ſuppreſſed in the territories of *Brandenburg*, and the ſubjects of that electorate prohibited, by a ſolemn edict, from ſtudying divinity in the academy of *Wittemberg* [d].

---

[c] The reader will find a more ample account of this matter in the controverſial writings of the divines of *Caſſel* and *Dermſtadt*, publiſhed at *Caſſel*, *Marpurg*, and *Gieſſen*, in the years 1632, 1636, 1647; and of which SALIG ſpeaks largely in his *Hiſt. Aug. Confeſſ.* tom. i. lib. iv. cap. ii. p. 756. Thoſe who underſtand the German language, may alſo conſult GARTH's *Hiſtoriſcher Bericht von dem Religions Weſen in Furſtenthum Heſſen*, 1706, in 4to.—CYPRIAN's *Unterricht von Kirchlicher Vereiniging der Proteſtanten*, p. 263. & *Appendix*, p. 101.—As alſo the *Acts* publiſhed in the *Unſchuldigen Nachrichten*, A. 1749. p. 25.

Attempts made towards a union between the Lutheran and Reformed churches.

III. It was deplorable to ſee two churches, which had diſcovered an equal degree of pious zeal and fortitude in throwing off the deſpotic yoke of *Rome*, divided among themſelves, and living in diſcords that were highly detrimental to the intereſts of religion, and the well-being of ſociety. Hence ſeveral eminent divines and leading men, both among the Lutherans and Calviniſts, ſought anxiouſly after ſome method of uniting the two churches, though divided in their opinibns, in the bonds of Chriſtian charity and eccleſiaſtical communion. A competent knowledge of human nature and human paſſions was ſufficient to perſuade theſe wiſe and pacific mediators, that a perfect uniformity in religious opinions was not practicable, and that it would be entirely extravagant to imagine that any of theſe communities could ever be brought to embrace univerſally, and without limitation, the doctrines of the other. They made it, therefore, their principal buſineſs to perſuade thoſe, whoſe ſpirits were inflamed with the heat of controverſy,—that the points in debate between the two churches were not eſſential to true religion;—that the fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity were received and profeſſed in both communions;—and, that the difference of opinion between the contending parties, turned either upon points of an abſtruſe and incomprehenſible nature, or upon matters of indifference, which neither tended to render mankind wiſer nor better, and in which the intereſts of genuine piety were in no wiſe concerned. Thoſe who viewed things in this point of light, were obliged to acknowledge, that the diverſity of opinions between the two churches was by no means a ſufficient reaſon for their ſeparation; and that of conſequence they were called, by the dictates of that Goſpel which they both profeſſed, to live not only in the mutual exerciſe of Chriſtian charity, but alſo to enter into the fraternal bonds of church communion. The greateſt part of the *Reformed* doctors ſeemed diſpoſed to acknowledge, that the errors of the Lutherans were not of a momentous nature, nor of a pernicious tendency; and that the fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity had not undergone any remarkable alteration in that communion; and thus on their ſide an important ſtep was made towards peace and union between the two churches. But the greateſt part of the Lutheran doctors declared, that they could not form a like judgment with reſpect to the doctrine of the Reformed churches; they maintained tenaciouſly the importance of the points which divided the two communions, and affirmed, that a conſiderable part of the controverſy turned upon the fundamental principles of all religion and virtue. It is not at all ſurpriſing, that this ſteadineſs and conſtancy of the Lutherans was branded by the oppoſite party with the epithets of moroſe obſtinacy, ſupercilious arrogance, and ſuch like odious denominations. The Lutherans were not behind-hand with their adverſaries in acrimony of ſtyle; they recriminated with vehemence, and charged their accuſers with inſtances of miſconduct, different in kind, but equally condemnable. They reproached them with having dealt diſingenuouſly, by diſguiſing, under ambiguous expreſſions, the real doctrine of the Reformed churches; they obſerved further, that their adverſaries, notwithſtanding their conſummate prudence and circumſpection, gave plain proofs, on many occaſions, that their propenſity to a reconciliation between the two churches aroſe from views of private intereſt, rather than from a zeal for the public good.

---

[d] The edicts of SIGISMUND and his ſucceſſors, relating to this change in the ſtate of religion in *Brandenburg*, have been ſeveral times republiſhed in one collection. Beſides theſe there are many books, treatiſes, and pamphlets, which give an account of this remarkable tranſaction, and of which the reader will find a complete liſt in the German work entitled, *Unſchuldigen Nachrichten*, An. 1745, p. 34. A. 1746, p. 326. compared with JO. CAROL. KOCHERI *Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ*, p. 312.—The reader who deſires to attain to a perfect acquaintance with this controverſy, and to be able to weigh the merits of the cauſe, by having a true ſtate of the caſe before him, will do well to conſult ARNOLDI *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. et Hæret.* p. ii. lib. xvii. c. vii. p. 965.—CYPRIAN's *Unterright von der Vereinigung der Proteſtant*, p. 75. and *in Append. Monum.* p. 225.—*Unſchuldigen Nachrichten*, A. 1729, p. 1067, *et* A. 1732, p. 715.—They who affirm that the elector's ultimate end, in changing the face of religion in his dominions, was not the proſpect of augmenting and extending his authority, found their opinion rather on conjecture than on demonſtration; nor do they confirm this aſſertion by teſtimonies that are ſufficient to bring full conviction. It muſt, however, be acknowledged, on the other hand, that their conjectures have neither an abſurd nor an improbable aſpect.

Declaration of the ſynod of *Charenton.*

IV. Among the public tranſactions relative to the project of a union between the *Reformed* and *Lutheran* churches, we muſt not omit mentioning the attempt made by JAMES I., king of *Great Britain*, to accompliſh this ſalutary purpoſe, in the year 1615. The perſon employed for this end by the Britiſh monarch, was PETER DU MOULIN, the moſt eminent among the Proteſtant doctors in *France* [e]; but this deſign was neither carried on with *ſpirit*, nor attended with ſucceſs [f].

---

[e] See LA VASSOR, *Hiſt. de* LOUIS XIII. tom. ii. p. ii. p. 21.

☞ [f] King James, who would have abandoned the moſt important and noble deſign, at any time, to diſcuſs a point of grammar or theology, or to gain a point of intereſt for himſelf or his minions, neglected this union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, which he had begun to promote with ſuch an appearance of piety and zeal.

Another attempt of the ſame pacific nature was made in the year 1631, in the ſynod of *Charenton*, in which an act was paſſed by the Reformed doctors of that reſpectable aſſembly, declaring the Lutheran ſyſtem of religion conformable with the ſpirit of true piety, and free from pernicious and fundamental errors. By this act, a fair opportunity was offered to the Lutherans of joining with the Reformed church upon honourable terms, and of entering into the bonds both of civil and religious communion with their Calviniſtical brethren [g]. But this candid and charitable proceeding was attended with very little fruit, ſince few of the Lutherans were diſpoſed to embrace the occaſion that was here ſo freely offered them, of terminating the diſſentions that ſeparated the two churches. The ſame year a conference was held at *Leipſic* between the Saxon doctors, HOE, LYSER, and HOPFNER, on the one ſide, and ſome of the moſt eminent divines of *Heſſe-Caſſel* and *Brandenburg*, on the other; to the end that, by expoſing with fidelity and preciſion their reſpective doctrines, it might be more eaſily ſeen, what the real obſtacles were that ſtood in the way of the union projected between the two churches. This conference was conducted with decency and moderation, and the deliberations were neither diſturbed by intemperate zeal, nor by a proud ſpirit of contention and diſpute; but that openneſs of heart, that mutual truſt and confidence, which are ſo eſſential to the ſucceſs of all kinds of pacification, were wanting here. For though the doctors of the Reformed party expoſed, with the utmoſt preciſion and fairneſs, the tenets of their church, and made, moreover, many conceſſions, which the Lutherans themſelves could ſcarcely expect; yet the latter, ſuſpicious and fearful, and always apprehenſive of ſchemes, formed by artifice under the maſk of candour, to betray and enſnare them, did not dare to acknowledge, that they were ſatisfied with theſe explications and offers; and thus the conference broke up without having contributed in any reſpect to promote the ſalutary work of peace [b]. To form a true idea of theſe pacific deliberations, of the reaſons that gave riſe to them, and of the principles by which they were conducted, it will be neceſſary to ſtudy the civil hiſtory of this intereſting period with attention and care.

---

[g] BENOIT, *Hiſtoire de l' Edit de Nantes*, tom. ii. p. 544.—AYMON, *Actes des Synodes Nationaux des Egliſes Reformée, de France*, tom. ii. p. 500.—ITTIGII *Diſſert. de Synodi Carentonienſis indulgentia erga Lutheranos*, *Lipſ.* 1705, 4to.

The conferences at *Thorn* and *Caſſel*.

V. ULADISLAUS IV., king of *Poland*, formed a ſtill more extenſive plan of religious union than thoſe hitherto mentioned; he propoſed a reconciliation not only between the Reformed and Lutheran churches, but alſo between theſe two communions and that of *Rome*. For this purpoſe, he ordered a conference to be held at *Thorn*, in the year 1645, the iſſue of which, as might naturally have been expected, was far from being favourable to the projected union; for the perſons employed by the three churches to heal their diviſions, or at leaſt to calm their animoſities, returned from this conference with a greater meaſure of party-zeal, and a ſmaller portion of Chriſtian charity, than they had brought to it.

The conference held at *Caſſel* in the year 1661, by the order of WILLIAM VI., Landgrave of *Heſſe*, between MUSÆUS and HENICHIUS, profeſſors at *Rintelen*, on the ſide of the Lutherans, and

---

[b] TIMANNI GASSELII *Hiſtoria Sacra et Eccleſiaſtica*, p. ii. *in addendis*, p. 597—613., in which the *Acts* of this conference are publiſhed.—JO. WOLFG. JAEGERI *Hiſtoria Sæculi* xvii. Decenn. iv. p. 497. ☞ This teſtimony of Dr. MOSHEIM, who was himſelf a Lutheran, is ſingularly honourable to the Reformed doctors.

CURTIUS and HEINSIUS, of the univerſity of *Marpurg*, on that of the Reformed, was attended with much more ſucceſs; and, if it did not bring about a perfect uniformity of opinion, it produce what was much better, a ſpirit of Chriſtian charity and forbearance. For theſe candid doctors, after having diligently examined the nature, and weighed the importance, of the controverſies that divided the two churches, embraced each other with reciprocal marks of affection and eſteem, and mutually declared that their reſpective doctrines were leſs different from each other than was generally imagined; and that this difference was not of ſufficient moment to prevent their fraternal union and concord. But it happened unluckily, that theſe moderate doctors of *Rintelen* could not infuſe the ſame ſpirit of peace and charity that animated *them*, into their Lutheran brethren, nor perſuade them to view the difference of opinion, that divided the Proteſtant churches, in the ſame indulgent point of light in which they had conſidered them in the conference at *Caſſel*. On the contrary, this their moderation drew upon them the hatred of almoſt all the Lutherans; and they were loaded with bitter reproaches in a multitude of pamphlets [*i*], that were compoſed expreſsly to refute their ſentiments, and to cenſure their conduct. The pains that were taken after this period by the princes of the houſe of *Brandenburg*, and more eſpecially by FREDERIC WILLIAM and his ſon FREDERIC, in order to compoſe the diſſenſions and animoſity that divide the Proteſtants, and particularly to promote a fraternal union between the Reformed and Lutheran churches in the Pruſſian territories, and in the reſt of their dominions, are well known: and it is alſo equally notorious, that innumerable difficulties were formed againſt the execution of this ſalutary deſign.

[*i*] The writers who have given accounts of the conferences of *Thorn* and *Caſſel*, are enumerated by SAGITTARIUS, in his *Introd. ad Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. ii. p. 1604.—See alſo JAEGERI *Hiſtoria Sæculi* xvii. *Decenn.* v. p. 689. and *Decenn.* vii. p. 160. where the *Acts* of the conferences of *Caſſel* and *Thorn* are extant.—Add to theſe, JO. ALPHONS. TURRETINI *Nubes Teſtium pro moderato in rebus Theologicis judicio*, p. 178.—There is an ample account of the conference of *Caſſel* in the Life of MUSÆUS given by MOLLERUS in his *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 566. The reader will find in the ſame work, an accurate *Index* of the *Accounts* of this conference publiſhed on both ſides.

The pacific exploits of John Dureus.

VI. Beſides theſe public conferences, held by the authority of princes, in order to promote union and concord among Proteſtants, a multitude of individuals, animated by a ſpirit of true Chriſtian charity, embarked in this pious cauſe on their own private authority, and offered their mediation and good offices to reconcile the two churches. It is true, indeed, that theſe peace-makers were, generally ſpeaking, of the Reformed church; and that thoſe among the Lutherans, who appeared in this amiable character, were but few, in compariſon with the great number of Calviniſts that favoured this benevolent but arduous deſign. The moſt eminent of the Calviniſtical peace-makers was JOHN DUREUS, a native of *Scotland*, and a man juſtly celebrated on account of his univerſal benevolence, ſolid piety, and extenſive learning; but, at the ſame time, more remarkable for genius and memory, than for nicety of diſcernment and accuracy of judgment, as might be evinced by ſeveral proofs and teſtimonies, were this the proper place for diſcuſſions of that nature. Be that as it will, never, perhaps, was there ſuch an example of zeal and perſeverance as that exhibited by DUREUS, who, during the ſpace of forty years [k], ſuffered vexations,

---

[k] From the year 1631 to 1674.

and underwent labours, which required the firmeſt reſolution, and the moſt inexhauſtible patience; wrote, exhorted, admoniſhed, intreated, and diſputed; in a word, tried every method that human wiſdom could ſuggeſt, to put an end to the diſſenſions and animoſities that reigned among the Proteſtant churches. For it was not merely by the perſuaſive eloquence of his pen, or by forming plans in the ſilence of the cloſet, that this worthy divine performed the taſk which his benevolence and zeal engaged him to undertake; his activity and induſtry were equal to his zeal; he travelled through all the countries in *Europe* where the Proteſtant religion had obtained any footing; he formed connexions with the doctors of both parties; he addreſſed himſelf to kings, princes, magiſtrates, and miniſters; and by repreſenting, in lively and ſtriking colours, the utility and importance of the plan he had formed, hoped to engage them more or leſs in this good cauſe, or at leaſt to derive ſome ſuccour from their influence and protection. But here his views were conſiderably diſappointed; for though his undertaking was generally applauded; and though he met with a favourable and civil reception from the greateſt part of thoſe to whom he addreſſed himſelf, yet he found very few who were ſeriouſly diſpoſed to alleviate his labours, by lending him their aſſiſtance, and ſeconding his attempts by their influence and counſels. Nay ſome, ſuſpecting that the fervent and extraordinary zeal of Dureus aroſe from myſterious and ſiniſter motives, and apprehending that he had ſecretly formed a deſign of drawing the Lutherans into a ſnare, attacked him in their writings with animoſity and bitterneſs, and loaded him with the ſharpeſt invectives and reproaches. So that this well-meaning man, neglected at length by thoſe of his own communion, oppoſed and rejected by the followers of LUTHER, involved in various perplexities and diſtreſs, exhauſted by unſucceſsful labour, and oppreſſed and dejected by injurious treatment, perceived, by a painful experience, that he had undertaken a taſk which was beyond the power of a private perſon, and ſpent the remainder of his days in repoſe and obſcurity at *Caſſel* [l].

It may not be improper to obſerve here, that DUREUS, who, notwithſtanding the uprightneſs of his intentions in general, was ſometimes deficient in frankneſs and ingenuity, had annexed to his plan of reconciliation certain doctrines which, were they ſuſceptible of proof, would ſerve as a foundation for the union not only of the Lutherans and Calviniſts, but alſo of all the different ſects that bear the Chriſtian name. For, among other things, he maintained, that the *Apoſtles'*

---

[l] See COLERI *Hiſtoria* JOH. DURÆI, publiſhed in 4to at *Wittemberg* in 1716, to which, however, many important additions might be made from public records, and alſo from documents that have not as yet ſeen the light. Some records and documents, of the kind here referred to, have been publiſhed by HASÆUS, in his *Bibliotheca Bremenſ. Theologico-Philologica*, tom. i. p. 911. and tom. iv. p. 683. A ſtill greater number are given by GESSELIUS, in the *Addenda Irenica*, that are ſubjoined to his *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtica*, tom. ii. p. 614. The tranſactions of DURÆUS at *Marpurg* are mentioned by SCHENK, in his *Vitæ Profeſſorum Theologiæ Marpurg*, p. 202.—His attempts in *Holſtein* may be learned from the letters of LACKMAN and LOSSIUS, which are joined together in the ſame volume. His exploits in *Pruſſia* and *Poland* are recorded by JABLONSKY, in his *Hiſtoria Conſenſus Sendomirienſis*, p. 127. and his labours in *Denmark*, the *Palatinate*, and *Switzerland*, are mentioned reſpectively by ELSWICH, in his *Faſciculus Epiſtol. Theolog.* p. 147.—SEELEN's *Deliciæ Epiſtol.* p. 353. and in the *Muſeum Helvet.* tom. iii. iv. v.—See alſo JAEGERI *Hiſtoria Sæculi* xvii. *Decenn.* vii. p. 171.—BOHMIUS, *Engliſche Reformations Hiſtorie*, and more eſpecially an account of DURÆUS, publiſhed under my direction at *Helmſtadt*, in the year 1744, by BENZELIUS, and entitled, *Diſſertatio de* JOHAN. DURÆO, *maxime de Actis ejus Suecanis*. This Diſſertation contains a variety of anecdotes drawn from records not yet made public.

Creed was a complete body of divinity; the *Ten Commandments* a perfect ſyſtem of morals; and the *Lord's Prayer* a comprehenſive ſeries of petitions for all the bleſſings contained in the divine promiſes. Now if this notion, that theſe ſacred compoſitions contain all that is eſſential to faith, obedience, and devotion, had been univerſally entertained, or evidently demonſtrated, it would not have been a chimerical project to aim at a reconciliation of all Chriſtian churches upon this baſis, and to render theſe compoſitions the foundation of their coalition and the bond of their union. But it would have been highly chimerical to expect, that the Chriſtian ſects would univerſally adopt this notion, or be pleaſed to ſee the doctrines of Chriſtianity reduced to ſuch general principles. It is further to be obſerved, with reſpect to DUREUS, that he ſhewed a peculiar propenſity towards the ſentiments of the *Myſtics* and *Quakers*, on account of their tendency to favour his conciliatory and pacific project. Like them he placed the eſſence of religion in the *aſcent* of the ſoul to God, in calling forth the *hidden word*, in fanning the *divine ſpark* that reſides in the receſſes of the human mind, and, in conſequence of this ſyſtem, was intimately perſuaded, that differences merely in theological opinions did not at all concern the eſſence of true piety.

Matthiæ and Calixtus.

VII. Thoſe among the Lutherans that appeared the moſt zealous in this pacific cauſe, were JOHN MATTHIÆ [m], biſhop of *Strengnes* in *Sweden*, and GEORGE CALIXTUS, profeſſor of divinity at *Helmſtadt*, whom DUREUS had animated with a portion

---

☞ [m] MATTHIÆ had been chaplain to GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS, and was afterwards appointed, by that prince, preceptor to his daughter CHRISTINA, ſo famous in hiſtory, on account of the whimſical peculiarities of her character, her taſte for learning, and her deſertion of the Swediſh throne and the Proteſtant religion.

portion of his charitable and indulgent ſpirit. The former was a man of capacity and merit, the latter was eminently diſtinguiſhed among the doctors of this century, by his learning, genius, probity, and candour; but they both failed in the arduous undertaking in which they had engaged, and ſuffered conſiderably in their attempts to promote the cauſe of unity and concord. The *Olive-branches* [n] of MATTHIÆ, who entitled thus his pacific productions, were, by a royal edict, publicly condemned and ſuppreſſed in *Sweden;* and their author, in order to appeaſe the fury of his enemies, was obliged to reſign his biſhopric, and paſs the reſt of his days in retirement [o]. The zeal of CALIXTUS, in calming the tumultuous and violent ſpirit of the contending parties, drew upon him the bittereſt reproaches, and the warmeſt animoſity and reſentment from thoſe who were more bent on maintaining their peculiar opinions, than in promoting that charity which is the end of the commandment; and while he was labouring to remove all ſects and diviſions, he appeared to many of his brethren in the light of a new ſectary, who was founding the moſt pernicious of all ſects, even that of the *Syncretiſts*, who were ſuppoſed to promote peace and concord at the expence of truth. We ſhall, before we finiſh this chapter, endeavour to give a more particular and circumſtantial account of the ſentiments and trials of this great man, to whoſe charge many other things were laid, beſides the *crime* of endeavouring to unite the diſciples of the ſame maſter in the amiable bonds of charity, concord, and mutual forbearance; and whoſe opinions and deſigns excited warm conteſts in the Lutheran church.

---

[n] *Rami Olivæ Septentrionalis.*

[o] See SCHEFFERI *Suecia Litterata*, p. 123. and JOH. MOLLERI ad eam *Hypomnemata*, p. 317.—ARKENHOLTZ, *Memoires de la Reine* CHRISTINE, tom. i. p. 320. 505. tom. ii. p. 63.

VIII. The

The proſperous events that happened to the Lutheran church.

VIII. The external ſtate of the Lutheran church at this period was attended with various circumſtances of proſperity, among which we may reckon its ſtanding firm againſt the aſſaults of *Rome*, whoſe artifice and violence were in vain employed to bring on its deſtruction. It is well known, that a very conſiderable number of Lutherans reſided in thoſe provinces where the public exerciſe of their religion was prohibited. It has more eſpecially been ſhewn by the late memorable emigration of the *Saltzburgers* [*p*], that ſtill greater numbers of them lay concealed in that land of deſpotiſm and bigotry, where the ſmalleſt diſſent from popery, with whatever ſecrecy and circumſpection it may be diſguiſed, is conſidered as an enormous and capital crime; and that they preſerved their religious ſentiments and doctrines pure and uncorrupted amidſt the contagion of Romiſh ſuperſtition, which they always beheld with averſion and horror. In thoſe countries which are inhabited by perſons of different communions, and whoſe ſovereigns are members of the Romiſh church, we have numberleſs inſtances of the cruelty and injuſtice practiſed by the papiſts againſt thoſe that diſſent from them; and theſe cruelties are exerciſed under a pretext ſuggeſted by the moſt malevolent bigotry, which repreſents theſe diſſenters as ſeditious ſubjects, and conſequently as worthy of the moſt rigorous treatment. And yet it is certain, that, amidſt all theſe vexations, the Lutheran church has ſtood its ground; nor has either the craft or fury of its

---

☞ [*p*] For an account of the perſecuted Lutherans in the archbiſhopric of *Saltzbourg*, ſee BURNET's *Travels*. See more eſpecially a famous Latin diſcourſe, publiſhed at *Tubingen*, in the year 1732, under the following title: *Commentariolus Theologicus de non tolerandis in Religione Diſſentientibus, quam Præſide* CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFIO *defendet* WOLF. LUD. LETSCHING.

enemies been able, any where, to deprive it entirely of its rights and privileges. It may further be obſerved, that the doctrine of Luther was carried into *Aſia*, *Africa*, and *America*, by ſeveral perſons who fixed their habitations in thoſe diſtant regions, and was alſo introduced into ſome parts of *Europe*, where it had hitherto been unknown.

The progreſs of learning among the Lutherans.

IX. When we turn our view to the internal ſtate of the Lutheran church during this century, we ſhall find it improved in various reſpects; though ſeveral blemiſhes yet remained that clouded its luſtre. It muſt be acknowledged, to the honour of the Lutherans, that they cultivated all the various branches of literature, both ſacred and profane, with uncommon induſtry and ſucceſs, and made ſeveral improvements in the ſciences, which are too well known to ſtand in need of a particular mention; and of which a circumſtantial enumeration would be inconſiſtent with the brevity we propoſe to obſerve in this hiſtory. But if it cannot be denied, on the one hand, that the cauſe of religion gained by theſe improvements in learning, it muſt be owned, on the other, that ſome branches of ſcience were perverted by injudicious or ill-deſigning men, to corrupt the pure ſimplicity of genuine Chriſtianity, and to render its doctrines abſtruſe and intricate. Thus it too often happens in life, that the beſt things are the moſt egregiouſly abuſed.

About the commencement of this century, the ſciences chiefly cultivated in the ſchools were logic and metaphyſics; though the manner of treating them was almoſt entirely deſtitute of elegance, ſimplicity, and preciſion. But, in proceſs of time, the ſcene changed in the ſeminaries of learning; and the more entertaining and agreeable branches of literature, that poliſh wit, excite taſte, exerciſe judgment, and enrich memory, ſuch as civil and natural hiſtory, philology, antiquities, criticiſm,

ciſm, and eloquence, gained the aſcendant. Both theſe kinds of knowledge acquired alſo a more graceful, conſiſtent, and regular form than that under which they had hitherto appeared. But it happened moſt unluckily, that while the boundaries of ſcience were extended from day to day, and new diſcoveries and improvements were conſtantly enriching the republic of letters, the credit of learning began ſenſibly to decreaſe, and learned men ſeemed gradually to loſe thoſe peculiar marks of veneration and diſtinction that the novelty of their character, as well as the excellence and importance of their labours, had hitherto drawn from the public. Among the various circumſtances that contributed to this decline of literary glory, we may particularly reckon the multitude of thoſe who, without natural capacity, taſte, or inclination, were led, by authority or a deſire of applauſe, to literary purſuits; and by their ignorance or their pedantry, caſt a reproach upon the republic of letters.

The ſtate of philoſophy.

The Ariſtotelians triumph.

X. The only kind of philoſophy that was taught in the Lutheran ſchools, during the greateſt part of this century, was that of ARISTOTLE, dreſſed up in that ſcholaſtic form that increaſed its native intricacy and ſubtilty. And ſuch was the devout and exceſſive veneration entertained by many for this abſtruſe ſyſtem, that any attempt to reject the Grecian oracle, or to correct its deciſions, was looked upon as of the moſt dangerous conſequence to the intereſts of the church, and as equally criminal with a like attempt upon the ſacred writings. Thoſe who diſtinguiſhed themſelves in the moſt extraordinary manner by their zealous and invincible attachment to the Peripatetic philoſophy, were the divines of *Leipſic*, *Tubingen*, *Helmſtadt*, and *Altorf*. The enchantment, however, was not univerſal; and there were many who, withdrawing their private judgment from the yoke of authority, were bold enough to ſee with their own eyes; and of conſequence diſcerned the blemiſhes that were indeed ſufficiently viſible in the pretended wiſdom of the Grecian ſage. The firſt attempt to reduce his authority within narrow bounds was made by certain pious and prudent divines, who though they did not pretend to diſcourage all philoſophical inquiries, yet were deſirous of confining them to a few ſelect ſubjects; and complained, that the pompous denomination of philoſophy was too frequently proſtituted [q], by being applied to unintelligible diſtinctions, and words, or rather ſounds, deſtitute of ſenſe. Theſe were ſucceeded in their diſlike of the Peripatetic philoſophy by the diſciples of RAMUS, who had credit enough to baniſh it from ſeveral ſeminaries of learning, and to ſubſtitute in its place the ſyſtem of their maſter, which was of a more practical kind, and better adapted to the purpoſes of life [r]. But if the philoſophy of ARISTOTLE met with adverſaries who oppoſed it upon ſolid and rational principles, it had alſo enemies of a very different character, who imprudently declaimed againſt philoſophy in general, as highly detrimental to the cauſe of religion and the intereſts of ſociety. Such was the fanatical extravagance of DANIEL HOFFMAN, profeſſor at *Helmſtadt*, who diſcovered, in this controverſy, an equal degree of ignorance and animoſity; and ſuch alſo were the followers of ROBERT FLUDD, JACOB BEHMEN, and the Roſecrucians, who boaſted of having ſtruck out, by the aſſiſtance of *fire* and *divine illumination*, a new, wonderful,

---

[q] Such, among others, was WENSESLAS SCHILLINGIUS, of whom a particular account is given by ARNOLD, in his *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. et Haeret.* p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. vi.

[r] See JO. HERMAN AB ELSWICK, *De varia Ariſtotelis fortuna*, § xxi. p. 54. and WALCHIUS, *Hiſtoria Logices*, lib. ii. cap. ii. ſect. iii. § v. in *Parergis* ejus *Academicis*, p. 613.

derful, and celeſtial ſyſtem of philoſophy, of which mention has been already made [s]. Theſe adverſaries of the Stagirite were divided among themſelves, and this diminiſhed the ſtrength and vigour of their oppoſition to the common enemy. But had they been ever ſo cloſely united in their ſentiments and meaſures, they would not have been able to overturn the empire of ARISTOTLE, which was deeply rooted in the ſchools through long poſſeſſion, and had a powerful ſupport in the multitude of its votaries and defenders.

The freedom of philoſophical inquiry gains ground.

XI. The Peripatetic ſyſtem had ſtill more formidable adverſaries to encounter in DES CARTES and GASSENDI, whoſe writings were compoſed with that perſpicuity and preciſion that rendered them ſingularly agreeable to many of the Lutheran doctors of this century, and made them look with contempt on that obſolete and barren philoſophy of the ſchools, which was expreſſed in uncouth terms and barbarous phraſes, without taſte, elegance, or accuracy. The votaries of ARISTOTLE beheld with envy theſe new philoſophers, uſed their moſt zealous endeavours to bring them into diſcredit, and, for this purpoſe, repreſented their reſearches and principles as highly detrimental to the intereſts of religion and the growth of true piety. But when they found, by experience, that theſe methods of attack proved unſucceſsful, they changed their manner of proceeding, and (like a prudent general, who, beſieged by a ſuperior force, abandons his outworks and retires into the citadel) they relinquiſhed much of their jargon, and defended only the main and eſſential principles of their ſyſtem. To render theſe principles more palatable, they began to adorn them with the graces of elocution, and to mingle with their philoſophical tenets the charms of polite literature.

---

[s] See above, in the *General Hiſtory of the Church*, § xxxi.

terature. They even went ſo far as to confeſs, that ARISTOTLE, though the prince of philoſophers, was chargeable with errors and defects, which it was both lawful and expedient to correct. But theſe conceſſions only ſerved to render their adverſaries more confident and enterpriſing, ſince they were interpreted as reſulting from a conſciouſneſs of their weakneſs, and were looked upon as a manifeſt acknowledgment of their defeat. In conſequence of this, the enemies of the Stagirite renewed their attacks with redoubled impetuoſity, and with a full aſſurance of victory; nor did they confine them to thoſe branches of the Peripatetic philoſophy which were allowed by its votaries to ſtand in need of correction, but levelled them, without diſtinction, at the whole ſyſtem, and aimed at nothing leſs than its total diſſolution. GROTIUS, indeed, who marched at the head of theſe philoſophical reformers, proceeded with a certain degree of prudence and moderation. PUFFENDORF, in treating of the law of nature and of the duties of morality, threw off, with more boldneſs and freedom, the Peripatetic yoke, and purſued a method entirely different from that which had been hitherto obſerved in the ſchools. This freedom drew upon him a multitude of enemies, who loaded him with the bittereſt reproaches; his example was nevertheleſs followed by THOMASIUS, profeſſor of law in the academy of *Leipſic*, and afterwards at *Hall*, who attacked the Peripatetics with new degrees of vehemence and zeal. This eminent man, though honourably diſtinguiſhed by the excellence of his genius and the ſtrength of his reſolution, was not, perhaps, the propereſt perſon that could be pitched upon to manage the intereſts of philoſophy. His views, nevertheleſs, were vaſt; he aimed at the reformation of philoſophy in general, and of the Peripatetic ſyſtem in particular; and he aſſidu-

ouſly

ouſly employed both the power of exhortation and the influence of example, in order to perſuade the Saxons to reject the Ariſtotelian ſyſtem, which he had never read, and which moſt certainly he did not underſtand. The ſcheme of philoſophy, that he ſubſtituted in its place, was received with little applauſe, and ſoon ſunk into oblivion; but his attempt to overturn the ſyſtem of the Peripatetics, and to reſtore the freedom of philoſophical inquiry, was attended with remarkable ſucceſs, made, in a little time, the moſt rapid progreſs, and produced ſuch admirable effects, that THOMASIUS is juſtly looked upon, to this day, as the chief of thoſe bold ſpirits who pulled down philoſophical tyranny from its throne in *Germany*, and gave a mortal blow to what was called the *Sectarian Philoſophy* [t] in that country. The firſt ſeminary of learning that adopted the meaſures of THOMASIUS was that of *Hall* in *Saxony*, where he was profeſſor; they were afterwards followed by the reſt of the German ſchools, by ſome ſooner, and by others later; and from thence a ſpirit of philoſophical liberty began to ſpread itſelf into other countries, where the Lutheran religion was eſtabliſhed. So that, towards the concluſion of this century, the Lutherans enjoyed a perfect liberty of conducting their philoſophical reſearches in the manner they judged the moſt conformable with truth and reaſon, of departing from the mere dictates of authority in matters of ſcience, and of propoſing publicly every one his reſpective opinions. This liberty was not the conſequence of any poſitive decree of the ſtate, nor was it inculcated by any law of the church; it ſeemed to

result

☞ [t] By the *Sectarian Philoſophers* were meant, thoſe who followed implicitly ſome one of the ancient philoſophical ſects, without daring to uſe the dictates of their private judgment, to correct or modify the doctrines or expreſſions of theſe hoary guides.

reſult from that inviſible diſpoſal of things, which we call accident, and certainly proceeded from the efforts of a few great men, ſeconding and exciting that natural propenſity towards free inquiry, that can never be totally extinguiſhed in the human mind. Many employed this liberty in extracting, after the manner of the ancient *Eclectics*, what they thought moſt conformable to reaſon, and moſt ſuſceptible of demonſtration, from the productions of the different ſchools, and connecting theſe extracts in ſuch a manner as to conſtitute a complete body of philoſophy. But ſome made a yet more noble uſe of this ineſtimable privilege, by employing, with indefatigable zeal and induſtry, their *own* faculties in the inveſtigation of truth, and building upon ſolid and unchangeable principles a new and ſublime ſyſtem of philoſophy. At the head of theſe we may place LEIBNITZ, whoſe genius and labours have deſervedly rendered his name immortal [u].

In this conflict between the reformers of philoſophy and the votaries of ARISTOTLE, the latter loſt ground from day to day, and his ſyſtem, in conſequence of the extremes that reformers often fall into, grew ſo diſguſting and odious, that condemnation was paſſed on every part of it. Hence the ſcience of *Metaphyſics*, which the Grecian ſage had conſidered as the maſter-ſcience, as the original fountain of all true philoſophy, was ſpoiled of its honours, and fell into contempt; nor was the authority and influence even of DES CARTES (who alſo ſet out, in his enquiries, upon metaphyſical principles) ſufficient to ſupport it againſt the prejudices of the times. However, when the firſt heat of oppoſition began to cool, and the rage of party to ſubſide, this degraded ſcience was not only recalled from its exile, by the interpoſition and credit of LEIBNITZ, but was alſo reinſtated in its former dignity and luſtre.

---

[u] The curious reader will find an accurate and ample account of this revolution in philoſophy, in the learned BRUCKER's *Hiſtoria Critica Philoſophiæ*.

The virtues and defects of the Lutheran doctors.

XII. The defects and vices of the Lutheran clergy have been circumſtantially expoſed, and even exaggerated by many writers, who ſeem to require in the miniſters of the Goſpel a degree of perfection, which ought indeed always to be aimed at, but which no wiſe obſerver of human nature can ever hope to ſee generally reduced to practice. Theſe cenſurers repreſent the leading men of the Lutheran church as arrogant, contentious, deſpotic, and uncharitable; as deſtitute of Chriſtian ſimplicity and candour; fond of quibbling and diſpute; judging of all things by the narrow ſpirit of party; and treating with the utmoſt antipathy and averſion thoſe that differ from them ever ſo little in religious matters. The leſs conſiderable among the Lutheran doctors were charged with ignorance, with a neglect of the ſacred duties of their ſtation, and with a want of talent in their character as public teachers. And the whole body were accuſed of avarice, lazineſs, want of piety, and corruption of manners.

It will be acknowledged, without difficulty, by thoſe who have ſtudied with attention and impartiality the genius, manners, and hiſtory of this century, that the Lutheran clergy are not wholly irreproachable with reſpect to the matters that are here laid to their charge, and that many Lutheran churches were under the direction of paſtors who were highly deficient, ſome in zeal, others in abilities, many in both, and conſequently ill qualified for propagating the truths of Chriſtianity with wiſdom and ſucceſs. But this reproach is not peculiarly applicable to the ſeventeenth century; it is a general charge that, with too much truth, may be brought againſt all the ages of the church. On the other hand, it muſt be acknowledged, by all ſuch as are not blinded by ignorance or partiality, that the whole of the Lutheran clergy did not conſiſt of theſe unworthy paſtors, and that many of the Lutheran doctors of this century were diſtinguiſhed by their learning, piety, gravity and wiſdom. Nay, perhaps it might be difficult to decide, whether in our times, in which ſome pretend that the ſanctity of the primitive doctors is revived in ſeveral places, there be not as many that do little honour to the paſtoral character as in the times of our anceſtors? It muſt further be obſerved, that many of the defects which are invidiouſly charged upon the doctors of this age, were in a great meaſure owing to the infelicity of the times. They were the unhappy effects of thoſe public calamities which a dreadful war, of thirty years duration, produced in *Germany*; they derived ſtrength from the influence of a corrupt education, and were ſometimes encouraged by the protection and countenance of vitious and profligate magiſtrates.

The vices of the Lutheran clergy partly owing to the times in which they lived.

XIII. That the vices of the Lutheran clergy were partly owing to the infelicity of the times, will appear evident from ſome particular inſtances. It muſt be acknowledged that, during the greateſt part of this century, neither the diſcourſes of the pulpit nor the inſtructions of the ſchools were adapted to promote among the people, juſt ideas of religion, or to give them a competent knowledge of the doctrines and precepts of the Goſpel. The eloquence of the pulpit, as ſome ludicrouſly and too juſtly repreſent it, was reduced, in many places, to the noiſy art of bawling (during a certain ſpace of time meaſured by a ſand-glaſs) upon various points of theology, which the orators underſtood but very little, and which the people did not underſtand at all; and when the important doctrines and precepts of Chriſtianity were introduced in theſe public diſcourſes, they were frequently disfigured by tawdry and puerile ornaments, wholly inconſiſtent with the ſpirit and genius of the divine wiſdom that ſhines forth in the Goſpel, and were thus, in a great meaſure, deprived of their native beauty, efficacy, and power. All this muſt be confeſſed; but perhaps it may not appear ſurpriſing, when all things are duly conſidered. The miniſters of the Goſpel had their heads full of ſonorous and empty words, of trivial diſtinctions and metaphyſical ſubtilties, and very ill furniſhed with that kind of knowledge that is adapted to touch the heart and to reform the life; they had alſo few models of true eloquence before their eyes; and therefore it is not much to be wondered, if they dreſſed out their diſcourſes with foreign and taſteleſs ornaments.

The charge brought againſt the univerſities, that they ſpent more time in ſubtile and contentious controverſy, than in explaining the holy Scriptures, teaching the duties of morality, and promoting a ſpirit of piety and virtue, though too juſt, yet may alſo be alleviated by conſidering the nature and circumſtances of the times. The Lutherans were ſurrounded with a multitude of adverſaries, who obliged them to be perpetually in a poſture of defence; and the Roman-catholics, who threatened their deſtruction, contributed, in a more particular manner, to excite in their doctors that polemic ſpirit, which unfortunately became a habit, and had an unhappy influence on the exerciſe both of their academical and paſtoral functions. In time of war, the military art not only becomes ſingularly reſpectable, but is preferred, without heſitation, before all others, on account of its tendency to maintain the ineſtimable bleſſings of liberty and independence; and thus, in the midſt of theological commotions,

motions, the ſpirit of-controverſy, by becoming neceſſary, gains an aſcendant, which, even when the danger is over, it is unwilling to loſe. It were indeed ardently to be wiſhed, that the Lutherans had treated with more mildneſs and charity thoſe who differed from them in religious opinions, and had diſcovered more indulgence and forbearance towards ſuch, more eſpecially, as by ignorance, fanaticiſm, or exceſſive curioſity, were led into error, without pretending, nevertheleſs, to diſturb the public tranquillity by propagating their particular ſyſtems. But they had unhappily imbibed a ſpirit of perſecution in their early education; this was too much the ſpirit of the times, and it was even a leading maxim with our anceſtors, that it was both lawful and expedient to uſe ſeverity and force againſt thoſe whom they looked upon as heretics. This maxim was derived from *Rome*; and even thoſe who ſeparated from that church did not find it eaſy to throw off, all of a ſudden, that deſpotic and uncharitable ſpirit that had ſo long been the main-ſpring of its government, and the general characteriſtic of its members. Nay, in their narrow views of things, their very piety ſeemed to ſuppreſs the generous movements of fraternal love and forbearance; and the more they felt themſelves animated with a zeal for the divine glory, the more difficult did they find it to renounce that ancient and favourite maxim, which had ſo often been ill interpreted and ill applied, that *whoever is found to be an enemy to God, ought alſo to be declared an enemy to his country* [*w*].

☞ [*w*] It were to be wiſhed that the Lutherans had not, in many places, perſevered in theſe ſevere and deſpotic principles longer than other Proteſtant churches. Until this very day, the Lutherans of *Frankfort* on the *Maine* have always refuſed to permit the *Reformed* to celebrate public worſhip within the bounds, or even in the ſuburbs, of that city. Many attempts have been made to conquer their obſtinacy in this reſpect, but hitherto without ſucceſs.

The eccleſiaſtical laws and polity of the Lutherans.

XIV. There were few or no changes introduced, during this century, into the form of government, the method of worſhip, and the external rites and ceremonies of the Lutheran church. Many alterations would indeed have been made in all theſe, had the princes and ſtates of that communion judged it expedient to put in execution the plans that had been laid by THOMASIUS, and other eminent men, for reforming its eccleſiaſtical polity. Theſe plans were built upon a new principle, which ſuppoſed, that the majeſty and ſupreme authority of the ſovereign was the only ſource of church-power. On this fundamental principle, which theſe great men took all imaginable pains to prove, by ſolid and ſtriking arguments, they raiſed a voluminous ſyſtem of laws, which, in the judgment of many, evidently tended to this concluſion: that the ſame ſovereign who preſides in the ſtate ought to rule in the church; that prince and pontif are inſeparable characters; and that the miniſters of the Goſpel are not the ambaſſadors of the Deity, but the deputies or vicegerents of the civil magiſtrate. Theſe reformers of Lutheraniſm did not ſtop here; they reduced within narrower bounds the few privileges and advantages that the clergy yet retained; and treated many of the rites, inſtitutions, and cuſtoms of our church, as the remains of popiſh ſuperſtition. Hence an abundant ſource of contention was opened, and a long and tedious controverſy was carried on with warmth and animoſity between the clergy and civilians. We leave others to determine with what views theſe debates were commenced and fomented, and with what ſucceſs they were reſpectively carried on by the contending parties. We ſhall only obſerve, that their effects and conſequences were unhappy, as, in many places, they proved, in the iſſue, detrimental to the reputation of the clergy, to the dignity and authority of religion, and to the peace and proſperity of the Lutheran church [x]. The preſent ſtate of that church verifies too plainly this obſervation. It is now its fate to ſee few entering into its public ſervice, who are adapted to reſtore the reputation it has loſt, or to maintain that which it yet retains. Thoſe who are diſtinguiſhed by illuſtrious birth, uncommon genius, and a liberal and ingenuous turn of mind, look upon the ſtudy of theology, which has ſo little external honours and advantages to recommend it, as below their ambition; and hence the number of wiſe, learned, and eminent miniſters grows leſs conſiderable from day to day. This circumſtance is deeply lamented by thoſe among us who conſider with attention the dangerous and declining ſtate of the Lutheran church; and it is to be feared, that our deſcendants will have reaſon to lament it ſtill more bitterly.

The moſt eminent Lutheran writers.

XV. The eminent writers that adorned the Lutheran church through the courſe of this century, were many in number. We ſhall only mention thoſe whom it is moſt neceſſary for a ſtudent of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory to be more particularly acquainted with; ſuch are ÆGIDIUS and NICHOLAS HUNNIUS—LEONARD HUTTER—JOSEPH and JOHN ERNESTI GERHARD—GEORGE

☞ [x] It has been the ill hap even of well-deſigning men to fall into pernicious extremes, in the controverſies relating to the foundation, power, and privileges of the church. Too few have ſteered the middle way, and laid their plans with ſuch equity and wiſdom as to maintain the ſovereignty and authority of the *ſtate*, without reducing the *church* to a mere creature of civil policy. The reader will find a moſt intereſting view of this nice and important ſubject, in the learned and ingenious biſhop of *Glouceſter's Alliance between Church and State*, and in his *Dedication* of the ſecond volume of his *Divine Legation of Moſes*, to my Lord MANSFIELD.

and Frederick Ulric Calixtus—the Mentzers—the Olearius's—Frederic Baldwin—Albert Grawer—Matthias Hoe—the Carpzovius's—John and Paul Tarnovius—John Affelman—Eilhart Luber—the Lysers—Michael Walther—Joachim Hildebrand—John Valentine Andreas—Solomon Glassius—Abraham Calovius—Theodore Hackspan—John Hulseman—Jacob Weller—Peter and John Mausæus, brothers—John Conrad Danhaver—John George Dorschæus—John Arndt—Martin Geyer—John Adam Schartzer—Balthazar and John Meisner—Augustus Pfeiffer—Henry and John Muller—Justus Christopher Schomer—Sebastian Schmidt—Christopher Horsholt—the Osianders—Philip Jacob Spener—Geb. Theodore Meyer—Fridem. Bechman—and others [y].

An hiſtorical view of the religious doctrine of the Lutherans.

XVI. The doctrine of the Lutheran church remained entire during this century; its fundamental principles received no alteration, nor could any doctor of that church, who ſhould have preſumed to renounce or invalidate any of thoſe theological points that are contained in the *ſymbolical books* of the Lutherans, have met with toleration and indulgence. It is, however, to be obſerved, that, in later times, various circumſtances contributed to diminiſh, in many places, the authority of theſe *ſymbolical* oracles, which had ſo long been conſidered as an almoſt infallible rule of faith and practice. Hence aroſe that unbounded liberty which is at this day enjoyed by all who are not inveſted with the character of public teachers, of diſſenting from the deciſions of theſe *ſymbols* or creeds, and of declaring this diſſent in the manner they judge the moſt expedient. The caſe was very different in former times: whoever ventured to oppoſe any of the received doctrines of the church, or to ſpread new religious opinions among the people, was called before the higher powers to give an account of his conduct, and very rarely eſcaped without ſuffering in his fortune or reputation, unleſs he renounced his innovations. But the teachers of novel doctrines had nothing to apprehend, when, towards the concluſion of this century, the Lutheran churches adopted that leading maxim of the Arminians, that *Chriſtians were accountable to God alone for their religious ſentiments; and that no individual could be juſtly puniſhed by the magiſtrate for his erroneous opinions, while he conducted himſelf like a virtuous and obedient ſubject, and made no attempts to diſturb the peace and order of civil ſociety.* It were to be wiſhed, that this religious liberty, which the dictates of equity muſt approve, but of which the virtuous mind alone can make a wiſe and proper uſe, had never degenerated into that unbridled licentiouſneſs that holds nothing ſacred, but with an audacious inſolence tramples under foot the ſolemn truths of religion, and is conſtantly endeavouring to throw contempt upon the reſpectable profeſſion of its miniſters.

---

[y] For an account of the lives and writings of theſe authors, ſee Witte's *Memoriæ Theologorum*, and his *Diarium Biographicum*; as alſo Pippingius, Goesius, and other writers of literary hiſtory.

Sacred philology cultivated among the Lutherans.

XVII. The various branches of ſacred erudition were cultivated with uninterrupted zeal and aſſiduity among the Lutherans, who, at no period of time, were without able commentators, and learned and faithful guides for the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. It is natural to mention here TARNOVIUS, GERHARD, HACSPAN, CALIXTUS, ERASMUS, SCHMIDT, to whom might be added a numerous liſt of learned and judicious expoſitors of the ſacred oracles. But what appears more peculiarly worthy of obſervation is, that the very period which ſome look upon as the moſt barren of learned productions, and the moſt remarkable for a general inattention to the branch of erudition now under conſideration, produced that ineſtimable and immortal work of SOLOMON GLASSIUS, which he publiſhed under the title of *Sacred Philology*, and than which none can be more uſeful for the interpretation of Scripture, as it throws an uncommon degree of light upon the language and phraſeology of the inſpired writers. It muſt, at the ſame time, be candidly acknowledged, that a conſiderable part of this century was more employed, by the profeſſors of the different univerſities, in defending, with ſubtilty and art, the peculiar doctrines of the Lutheran church, than in illuſtrating and explaining the Holy Scripture, which is the only genuine ſource of divine truth. Whatever was worthy of cenſure in this manner of proceeding, was abundantly repaired by the more modern divines of the Lutheran communion: for no ſooner did the rage of controverſy begin to ſubſide, than the greateſt part of them turned their principal ſtudies towards the expoſition and illuſtration of the Sacred Writings; and they were particularly animated in the execution of this laborious taſk, by obſerving the indefatigable induſtry of thoſe among the Dutch divines, who, in their interpretations of Scripture, followed the ſentiments and method of COCCEIUS. At the head of theſe modern commentators we may place, with juſtice, SEBASTIAN SCHMIDT, who was at leaſt the moſt laborious and voluminous expoſitor of this age. After this learned writer, may be ranked CALOVIUS, GEIER, SCHOMER, and others of inferior note.

note [z]. The conteſts excited by the perſons called *Pietiſts*, though unhappy in ſeveral reſpects, were nevertheleſs attended with this good effect, that they engaged many to apply themſelves to the ſtudy of the Holy Scriptures, which they had too much neglected before that period, and to the peruſal of the commentators and interpreters of the ſacred oracles. Theſe commentators purſued various methods, and were unequal both in their merit and ſucceſs. Some confined themſelves to the ſignification of the words of Scripture, and the literal ſenſe that belonged to the phraſes of the inſpired writers; others applied their expoſitions of Scripture to the deciſion of controverted points, and attacked their adverſaries either by refuting their falſe interpretations of Scripture, or by making uſe of their own commentaries to overturn their doctrines; a third ſort, after unfolding the ſenſe of Scripture, applied it carefully to the purpoſes of life and the direction of practice. We might mention another claſs of interpreters, who, by an aſſiduous peruſal of the writings of the Cocceians, are ſaid to have injudiciouſly acquired their defects, as appears by their turning the ſacred hiſtory into allegory, and ſeeking rather the more remote and myſterious ſenſe of Scripture, than its obvious and literal ſignification.

The Didactic theology; or, articles of faith adopted by the Lutherans.

XVIII. The principal doctors of this century followed, at firſt, the looſe method of deducing their theological doctrine from Scripture under a few general heads. This method had been obſerved in ancient times by Melancthon, and was vulgarly called *Common-Place* divinity. They, however, made uſe of the principles, terms, and ſubtile diſtinctions of the Peripatetic philoſophy, which was yet in high reputation, in explaining and illuſtrating each particular doctrine. The firſt perſon that reduced theology into a regular ſyſtem, and gave it a truly ſcientific and philoſophical form, was GEORGE CALIXTUS, a man of great genius and erudition, who had imbibed the ſpirit of the Ariſtotelian ſchool. His deſign, in general, was not ſo much cenſured, as the particular method he followed, and the form he gave to his theological ſyſtem; for he divided the whole ſcience of divinity into three parts, *viz.* the *end*, the *ſubject*, the *means*; and this diviſion, which was borrowed from ARISTOTLE, appeared extremely improper to many. This philoſophical method of ranging the truths of Chriſtianity was followed, with remarkable zeal and emulation, by the moſt eminent doctors in the different ſchools of learning, and even in our times it has its votaries. Some indeed had the courage to depart from it, and to exhibit the doctrines of religion under a different, though ſtill under a ſcientific, form; but they had few followers, and ſtruggled in vain againſt the empire of ARISTOTLE, who reigned with a deſpotic authority in the ſchools.

---

[z] See J. Franc. Budæi *Iſagoge in Theologiam*, lib. ii. cap. viii. p. 1686.

There were, however, many pious and good men, who beheld, with great diſpleaſure, this irruption of metaphyſics into the ſphere of theology, and never could be brought to reliſh this philoſophical method of teaching the doctrines of Chriſtianity. They earneſtly deſired to ſee divine truth freed from captious queſtions and ſubtilties, delivered from the ſhackles of an imperious ſyſtem, and exhibited with that beautiful ſimplicity, perſpicuity, and evidence, in which it appears in the ſacred writings. Perſons of this turn had their wiſhes and expectations in ſome meaſure anſwered, when, towards the concluſion of this century, the learned SPENER and others, animated by his exhortations and example, began to inculcate the truths and precepts of religion in a more plain and popular manner, and when the eclectics had ſucceeded ſo far as to dethrone ARISTOTLE, and to baniſh his philoſophy from the greateſt part of the Lutheran ſchools. SPENER was not ſo far ſucceſsful as to render univerſal his popular method of teaching theology; it was nevertheleſs adopted by a conſiderable number of doctors; and it cannot be denied, that, ſince this period, the ſcience of divinity, delivered from the jargon of the ſchools, has aſſumed a more liberal and graceful aſpect. The ſame obſervation may be applied to controverſial productions; it is certain that polemics were totally deſtitute of elegance and perſpicuity ſo long as ARISTOTLE reigned in the ſeminaries of learning, and that they were more or leſs embelliſhed and improved ſince the ſuppreſſion and diſgrace of the Peripatetic philoſophy. It is, however, to be lamented, that controverſy did not loſe, at this period, all the circumſtances that had ſo juſtly rendered it diſpleaſing; and that the defects, that had given ſuch offence in the theological diſputants of all parties, were far from being entirely removed. Theſe defects ſtill ſubſiſt, though perhaps in a leſs ſhocking degree; and whether we peruſe the polemic writers of ancient or modern times, we ſhall find too few among them who may be ſaid to be animated by the pure love of truth, without any mixture of pride, paſſion, or partiality, and whom we may pronounce free from the illuſions of prejudice and ſelf-love.

The ſtate of moral ſcience among the Lutherans.

XIX. The ſcience of morals, which muſt ever be eſteemed the *maſter-ſcience*, from its immediate influence upon life and manners, was, for a long time, neglected among the Lutherans. If we except a few eminent men, ſuch as ARNDT and GERHARD, who compoſed ſome popular treatiſes concerning the internal worſhip of the Deity, and

the

the duties of Chriſtians, there did not appear, during the greateſt part of this century, any moral writer of diſtinguiſhed merit. Hence it happened, that thoſe who applied themſelves to the buſineſs of reſolving what are called *Caſes of Conſcience*, were held in high eſteem, and their tribunals were much frequented. But as the true principles and foundations of morality were not, as yet, eſtabliſhed with a ſufficient degree of preciſion and evidence, their deciſions were often erroneous, and they were liable to fall into daily miſtakes. CALIXTUS was the firſt who ſeparated the objects of faith from the duties of morality, and exhibited the latter under the form of an independent ſcience. He did not, indeed, live to finiſh this work, the beginning of which met with univerſal applauſe; his diſciples however employed, with ſome degree of ſucceſs, the inſtructions they had received from their maſter, in executing his plan, and compoſing a ſyſtem of *Moral Theology*. This ſyſtem, in proceſs of time, fell into diſcredit, on account of the Peripatetic form under which it appeared; for, notwithſtanding the ſtriking repugnance that there is, in the very nature of things, between the beautiful ſcience of Morals and the perplexing intricacies of Metaphyſics, CALIXTUS could not abſtain from the latter in building his Moral ſyſtem. The moderns, however, ſtripped morality of the Peripatetic garment, calling to their aſſiſtance the law of nature, which had been explained and illuſtrated by PUFFENDORF and other authors, and comparing this law with the ſacred writings, they not only diſcovered the true ſprings of Chriſtian virtue, and entered into the true ſpirit and ſenſe of the divine laws, but alſo digeſted the whole ſcience of Morals into a better order, and demonſtrated its principles with a new and ſuperior degree of evidence.

XX. Theſe

Commotions and conteſts in the Lutheran church.

XX. Theſe improvements in theology and morality did not diffuſe ſuch a ſpirit of concord in the Lutheran church, as was ſufficient to heal ancient diviſions, or to prevent new ones. That church, on the contrary, was involved in the moſt lamentable commotions and tumults, during the whole courſe of this century, partly by the controverſies that aroſe among its moſt eminent doctors, and partly by the intemperate zeal of violent reformers, the fanatical predictions of pretended prophets, and the raſh meaſures of innovators, who ſtudiouſly ſpread among the people, new, ſingular, and, for the moſt part, extravagant opinions. The controverſies that divided the Lutheran doctors may be ranged under two claſſes, according to their different importance and extent, as ſome of them involved the whole church in tumult and diſcord, while others were leſs univerſal in their pernicious effects. Of the former claſs there were two controverſies, that gave abundant exerciſe to the Polemic talents of the Lutheran doctors during the greateſt part of this century; and theſe turned upon the religious ſyſtems that are generally known under the denominations of *Syncretiſm* and *Pietiſm*. Nothing could be more amiable than the principles that gave riſe to the former, and nothing more reſpectable and praiſe-worthy than the deſign that was propoſed by the latter. The *Syncretiſts* [a], animated with that fraternal love and that pacific ſpirit, which JESUS CHRIST had ſo often recommended as the peculiar characteriſtics of his true diſciples, uſed their warmeſt endeavours to promote union and concord among Chriſtians; and the *Pietiſts* had undoubtedly in view the reſtoration and advancement of that holineſs and virtue, that had ſuffered ſo much by the influence of licentious manners on the one hand, and by the turbulent ſpirit of controverſy on the other. Theſe two great and amiable virtues, that gave riſe to the projects and efforts of the two orders of perſons now mentioned, were combated by a third, even a zeal for maintaining the truth, and preſerving it from all mixture of error. Thus the love of truth was unhappily found to ſtand in oppoſition to the love of union, piety, and concord; and thus, in this preſent critical and corrupt ſtate of human nature, the unruly and turbulent paſſions of men can, by an egregious abuſe, draw the worſt conſequences from the beſt things, and render the moſt excellent principles and views productive of confuſion, calamity, and diſcord.

---

[a] The *Syncretiſts* were alſo called *Calixtines* from their chief, GEORGE CALIXTUS; and *Helmſtadians*, from the univerſity where their plan of doctrine and union took its riſe.

The riſe of the Syncretiſtical or Calixtine controverſies.

XXI. The origin of *Syncretiſm* was owing to GEORGE CALIXTUS of *Sleſwick*, a man of eminent and diſtinguiſhed abilities and merit, and who had few equals in this century, either in point of learning or genius. This great man being placed in a univerſity [*b*], which, from the very time of its foundation, had been remarkable for encouraging freedom of enquiry, improved this happy privilege, examined the reſpective doctrines of the various ſects that bear the Chriſtian name, and found, in the notions commonly received among divines, ſome things defective and erroneous. He accordingly gave early intimations of his diſſatisfaction with the ſtate of theology, and lamented, in a more particular manner, the diviſions and factions that reigned among the ſervants and diſciples of the ſame great maſter. He therefore turned his views to the ſalutary work of ſoftening the animoſities produced by theſe diviſions, and ſhewed the warmeſt deſire, not ſo much of eſtabliſhing a perfect harmony and concord between the jarring ſects, which no human power ſeemed capable of effecting, as of extinguiſhing the hatred, and appeaſing the reſentment, which the contending parties diſcovered too much in their conduct towards each other. His colleagues did not ſeem at all averſe to this pacific project; and the ſurpriſe that this their ſilence or acquieſcence muſt naturally excite, in ſuch as are acquainted with the theological ſpirit of the ſeventeenth century, will be diminiſhed, when it is conſidered, that the profeſſors of divinity at *Helmſtadt* bind themſelves, at their admiſſion, by an oath, to uſe their beſt and moſt zealous endeavours to heal the diviſions, and terminate the conteſts that prevail among Chriſtians. Neither CALIXTUS, however, nor his friends, eſcaped the oppoſition that it was natural to expect in the execution of ſuch an unpopular and comprehenſive project. They were warmly attacked, in the year 1639, by STATIUS BUSCHERUS, a Hanoverian eccleſiaſtic, a bigoted votary of RAMUS, a declared enemy to all philoſophy, and a man of great temerity and imprudence. This man, exaſperated at the preference CALIXTUS and his companions had given to the Peripatetic philoſophy over the principles of the *Ramiſts*, compoſed a very malignant book, entitled, *Crypto-Papiſmus novæ Theologicæ Helmſtadienſis* [c], in which CALIXTUS was charged with a long liſt of errors. Though this production made ſome ſmall impreſſion on the minds of certain perſons, it is nevertheleſs probable, that BUSCHER would have almoſt univerſally paſſed for a partial, malicious, and raſh accuſer, had his invectives and complaints rendered CALIXTUS more cautious and prudent. But the upright and generous heart of this eminent man, which diſdained diſſimulation to a degree that bordered upon the extreme of imprudence, excited him to ſpeak with the utmoſt frankneſs his private ſentiments, and thus to give a certain meaſure of plauſibility to the accuſations of his adverſary. Both he and his colleague CONRAD HORNEIUS maintained, with boldneſs and perſeverance, ſeveral propoſitions, which appeared, to many others beſides BUSCHER, new, ſingular, and of a dangerous tendency; and CALIXTUS more eſpecially, by the freedom and plainneſs with which he declared and defended his ſentiments, drew upon him the reſentment and indignation of the Saxon doctors, who, in the year 1645, were preſent at the conference of *Thorn*. He had been choſen by FREDERIC WILLIAM, elector of *Brandenburg*, as colleague and aſſiſtant to the divines he ſent from *Koningſberg* to theſe conferences; the Saxon deputies were greatly incenſed to ſee a Lutheran eccleſiaſtic in the character of an aſſiſtant to a deputation of Reformed doctors. This firſt cauſe of offence was followed by other incidents, in the courſe of theſe conferences, which increaſed the reſentment of the Saxons againſt CALIXTUS, and made them accuſe him of leaning to the ſide of the Reformed churches. We cannot enter here into a circumſtantial account of this matter, which would lead us from our main deſign. We ſhall only obſerve, that when theſe conferences broke up, the Saxon doctors, and more eſpecially HALSEMAN, WELLER, SCHARFIUS, and CALOVIUS, turned the whole force of their polemic weapons againſt CALIXTUS; and, in their public writings, reproached him with apoſtacy from the principles of Lutheraniſm, and with a propenſity towards the ſentiments both of the Reformed and Romiſh churches. This great man did not receive tamely the inſults of his adverſaries. His conſummate knowledge of the philoſophy that reigned in the ſchools, and his perfect acquaintance with the hiſtory of the church, rendered him an able diſputant; and accordingly he repelled, with the greateſt vigour, the attacks of his enemies, and carried on, with uncommon ſpirit and erudition, this important controverſy, until the year 1656, when death put an end to his labours, and tranſported him from theſe ſcenes of diſſenſion and tumult into the regions of peace and concord [*d*].

[*b*] The univerſity of *Helmſtadt*, in the dutchy of *Brunſwick*, founded in the year 1576.

---

[c] i. e. *Popery diſguiſed under the maſk of the new theological ſyſtem of* Helmſtadt.

The continuation and iſſue of theſe debates.

XXII. Neither the death of CALIXTUS, nor the deceaſe of his principal adverſaries, were ſufficient to extinguiſh the flame they had kindled; on the contrary, the conteſt was carried on, after that period, with more animoſity and violence

---

[*d*] Thoſe who deſire to be more minutely acquainted with the particular circumſtances of this famous controverſy, the titles and characters of the books publiſhed on that occaſion, and the doctrines that produced ſuch warm conteſts and ſuch deplorable diviſions, will do well to conſult WALCHIUS, CAROLUS, WEISMAN, ARNOLD, and other writers; but above all, the third volume of the *Cimbria Literata* of MOLLERUS, p. 121. in which there is an ample account of the life, tranſactions, and writings of CALIXTUS. But, if any reader ſhould puſh his curioſity ſtill further, and be ſolicitous to know the more ſecret ſprings that acted in this whole affair, the remote cauſes of the events and tranſactions relating to it, the ſpirit, views, and characters of the diſputants, the arguments uſed on both ſides; in a word, thoſe things that are principally intereſting and worthy of attention in controverſies of this kind, he will find no hiſtory that will ſatisfy him fully in theſe reſpects. A hiſtory that would throw a proper light upon theſe important matters, muſt be compoſed by a man of great candour and abilities; by one who knows the world, has ſtudied human nature, is furniſhed with materials and documents that lie as yet concealed in the cabinets of the curious, and is not unacquainted with the ſpirit that reigns and the cabals that are carried on in the courts of princes. But were ſuch an hiſtorian to be found, I queſtion very much, whether, even in our times, he could publiſh without danger all the circumſtances of this memorable conteſt.

than ever. The Saxon doctors, and more eſpecially CALOVIUS, inſulted the aſhes, and attacked the memory of this great man with unexampled bitterneſs and malignity; and, in the judgment of many eminent and worthy doctors, who were by no means the partiſans of CALIXTUS, conducted themſelves with ſuch imprudence and temerity, as were every way adapted to produce an open ſchiſm in the Lutheran church. They drew up a new kind of Creed, or confeſſion of the Lutheran faith [*e*], which they propoſed to place in the claſs of what the members of our communion call their *Symbolical books*, and which, of conſequence, all profeſſors of divinity and all candidates for the miniſtry would be obliged to ſubſcribe, as containing the true and genuine doctrine of the Lutheran church. By this new production of intemperate zeal, the friends and followers of CALIXTUS were declared unworthy of the communion of that church; and were, accordingly, ſuppoſed to have forfeited all right to the privileges and tranquillity that were granted to the Lutherans by the laws of the empire. The reputation of CALIXTUS found, nevertheleſs, ſome able defenders, who pleaded his cauſe with modeſty and candour; ſuch were TITIUS, HILDEBRAND, and other eccleſiaſtics, who were diſtinguiſhed from the multitude by their charity, moderation, and prudence. Theſe good men ſhewed, with the utmoſt evidence, that the new Creed, mentioned above, would be a perpetual ſource of contention and diſcord, and would thus have a fatal effect upon the true intereſts of the Lutheran church; but their counſels were overruled, and their admonitions neglected. Among the writers who oppoſed this Creed, was FREDERIC ULRIC CALIXTUS, who was not deſtitute of abilities, though much inferior to his father in learning, genius, and moderation. Of thoſe that ſtood forth in its vindication and defence, the moſt conſiderable were CALOVIUS and STRAUCHIUS. The polemic productions of theſe contending parties were multiplied from day to day, and yet remain as deplorable monuments of the intemperate zeal of the champions on both ſides of the queſtion. The invectives, reproaches, and calumnies, with which theſe productions were filled, ſhewed too plainly that many of theſe writers, inſtead of being animated with the love of truth, and a zeal for religion, were rather actuated by a keen ſpirit of party, and by the ſuggeſtions of vindictive pride and vanity. Theſe conteſts were of long duration; they were, however, at length ſuſpended, towards the cloſe of this century, by the death of thoſe who had been the principal actors in this ſcene of theological diſcord, by the abolition of the creed that had produced it, by the riſe of the new debates of a different nature, and by other circumſtances of inferior moment, which is needleſs to mention.

[*e*] The title of this new Creed was *Conſenſus repetiti Fidei veræ Lutheranæ.*

The opinions of Calixtus.

XXIII. It will be proper to give here ſome account of the accuſations that were brought againſt CALIXTUS by his adverſaries. The principal charge was, his having formed a project, not of uniting into one eccleſiaſtical body, as ſome have underſtood it, the Romiſh, Lutheran, and Reformed churches, but of extinguiſhing the hatred and animoſity that reigned among the members of theſe different communions, and joining them in the bonds of charity, mutual benevolence, and forbearance. This is the project, which was at firſt condemned, and is ſtill known under the denomination of *Syncretiſm* [f]. Several ſingular opinions were alſo laid to the charge of this great man, and were exaggerated and blackened, as the moſt innocent things generally are, when they paſs through the *medium* of malignity and party-ſpirit. Such were his notions concerning the *obſcure manner* in which the doctrine of the Trinity was revealed under the Old Teſtament diſpenſation; the appearances of the Son of God during that period; the *neceſſity* of good works to the attainment of everlaſting ſalvation; and God's being *occaſionally* [g] the author of ſin. Theſe notions, in the eſteem of many of the beſt judges of theological matters, have been always looked upon as of an indifferent nature, as opinions which, even were they falſe, do not affect the great and fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity. But the two great principles that CALIXTUS laid down as the foundation and groundwork of all his reconciling and pacific plans, gave much more offence than the plans themſelves, and drew upon him the indignation and reſentment of

---

[f] It is neither my deſign nor my inclination to adopt the cauſe of CALIXTUS; nor do I pretend to maintain, that his writings and his doctrines are exempt from error. But the love of truth obliges me to obſerve, that it has been the ill hap of this eminent man to fall into the hands of bad interpreters; and that even thoſe who imagine they have been more ſucceſsful than others in inveſtigating his true ſentiments, have moſt grievouſly miſunderſtood them. CALIXTUS is commonly ſuppoſed to have formed the plan of a *formal reconciliation* of the Proteſtants with the church of *Rome* and its pontifs; but this notion is entirely groundleſs, ſince he publicly and expreſsly declared, that the Proteſtants could by no means enter into the bonds of concord and communion with the Romiſh church, as it was conſtituted at this time; and that, if there had ever exiſted any proſpect of healing the diviſions that reigned between it and the Proteſtant churches, this proſpect had entirely vaniſhed ſince the council of *Trent*, whoſe violent proceedings and tyrannical decrees had rendered the union, now under conſideration, abſolutely impoſſible. He is further charged with having either approved or excuſed the greateſt part of thoſe errors and ſuperſtitions, that are looked upon as a diſhonour to the church of *Rome*; but this charge is abundantly refuted, not only by the various treatiſes, in which he expoſed the falſehood and abſurdity of the doctrines and opinions of that church, but alſo by the declarations of the Roman catholics themſelves, who acknowledge that CALIXTUS attacked them with much more learning and ingenuity than had been diſcovered by any other Proteſtant writer*. It is true, he maintained that the Lutherans and Roman-catholics did not differ about the *fundamental doctrines* of the Chriſtian faith; and it were to be wiſhed, that he had never aſſerted any ſuch thing, or, at leaſt, that he had expreſſed his meaning in more proper and inoffenſive terms. It muſt however be conſidered, that he always looked upon the popes and their votaries, as having *adulterated* theſe fundamental doctrines with an impure mixture or addition of many opinions and tenets, which no wiſe and good Chriſtian could adopt; and this conſideration diminiſhes a good deal the extravagance of an aſſertion, which, otherwiſe, would deſerve the ſevereſt cenſure. We ſhall not enter further into a review of the imputations that were caſt

* BOSSUET, in his *Traité de la Communion ſous les deux Eſpeces*, p. I. § ii. p. 12. ſpeaks thus of the eminent man now under conſideration: *Le fameux* GEORGE CALIXTE, *le plus habile des Lutheriens de nôtre tems, qui a ecrit le plus doctement contre nous, &c.*

upon CALIXTUS, by perſons more diſpoſed to liſten to his accuſers, than to thoſe who endeavour, with candour and impartiality, to repreſent his ſentiments and his meaſures in their true point of view. But if it ſhould be aſked here, what this man's real deſign was? we anſwer, that he laid down the following maxims: Firſt, *That if it were poſſible to bring back the church of* Rome *to the ſtate in which it was during the firſt five centuries, the Proteſtants would be no longer juſtified in rejecting its communion:* Secondly, *That the modern members of the Romiſh church,* though polluted with many intolerable errors, were not all *equally criminal*; and that *ſuch of them,* more eſpecially, *as ſincerely believed the doctrines they had learned from their parents or maſters, and by ignorance, education, or the power of habit, were hindered from perceiving the truth, were not to be excluded from ſalvation, nor deemed heretics; provided they gave their aſſent to the doctrines contained in the Apoſtles' Creed, and endeavoured ſeriouſly to govern their lives by the precepts of the Goſpel.* I do not pretend to defend theſe maxims, which ſeem, however, to have many patrons in our times; I would only obſerve, that the doctrine they contain is much leſs intolerable than that which was commonly imputed to CALIXTUS.

[g] *Per accidens.*

many. Thoſe principles were; Firſt, That *the fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity* (by which he meant thoſe elementary principles from whence all its truths flow) *were preſerved pure and entire in all the three communions, and were contained in that ancient form of doctrine, that is vulgarly known by the name of the Apoſtles' Creed.* And, ſecondly, That *the tenets and opinions, which had been conſtantly received by the ancient doctors during the firſt five centuries, were to be conſidered as of equal truth and authority with the expreſs declarations and doctrines of ſcripture.* The general plan of CALIXTUS was founded upon the *firſt* of theſe propoſitions; and he made uſe of the *ſecond* to give ſome degree of plauſibility to certain Romiſh doctrines and inſtitutions, which have been always rejected by the proteſtant church; and to eſtabliſh a happy concord between the various Chriſtian communions that had hitherto lived in the ſtate of diſſenſion and ſeparation from each other.

Debates carried on with the doctors of *Rintelen* and *Koningſberg*.

XXIV. The divines of *Rintelen, Koningſberg,* and *Jena,* were more or leſs involved in theſe warm conteſts. Thoſe of *Rintelen,* more eſpecially HENICHIUS and MUSÆUS, had, on ſeveral occaſions, and particularly at the conference of *Caſſel,* ſhewn plainly that they approved of the plan of CALIXTUS for removing the unhappy diſcords and animoſities that reigned among Chriſtians, and that they beheld with peculiar ſatiſfaction that part of it that had for its object union and concord among the Proteſtant churches. Hence they were oppoſed with great animoſity by the Saxon doctors and their adherents, in various polemic productions [*b*].

The pacific ſpirit of CALIXTUS diſcovered itſelf alſo at *Koningſberg.* JOHN LATERMAN, MICHAEL

[*b*] See ABRAH. CALOVII *Hiſtoria Syncretiſtica,* p. 618.— JO. GEORGII WALCHII *Introductio in controverſias Lutheran.* vol. i. p. 286.

BEHMIUS, and the learned CHRISTOPHER DRYER, who had been the diſciples of that great man, were at little pains to conceal their attachment to the ſentiments of their maſter. By this diſcovery, they drew upon them the reſentment of their colleagues JOHN BEHMIUS and CELESTINE MISLENTA, who were ſeconded by the whole body of the clergy of *Koningſberg*; and thus a warm controverſy aroſe, which was carried on, during many years, in ſuch a manner as did very little honour to either of the contending parties. The interpoſition of the civil magiſtrate, together with the deceaſe of BEHMIUS and MISLENTA, put an end to this inteſtine war, which was ſucceeded by a new conteſt of long duration between DRYER and his aſſociates on the one ſide, and ſeveral foreign divines on the other, who conſidered the ſyſtem of CALIXTUS as highly pernicious, and looked upon its defenders as the enemies of the church. This new controverſy was managed, on both ſides, with as little equity and moderation as thoſe which preceded it [*i*].

and thoſe of *Jena*.

XXV. It muſt, at the ſame time, be acknowledged, to the immortal honour of the divines of *Jena*, that they diſcovered the moſt conſummate prudence and the moſt amiable moderation in the midſt of theſe theological debates. For though they confeſſed ingenuouſly, that the ſentiments of CALIXTUS were not of ſuch a nature, as that they could be all adopted without exception, yet they maintained, that the greateſt part of his tenets were much leſs pernicious than the Saxon doctors had repreſented them; and that ſeveral of them were innocent, and might be freely admitted without any danger to the cauſe of truth. SOLOMON GLASSIUS, an eccleſiaſtic, renowned for the mildneſs of his temper, and the equity of his proceedings, examined with the utmoſt candour and impartiality the oppoſite ſentiments of the doctors, that were engaged in this important controverſy, and publiſhed the reſult of this examination, by the expreſs order of ERNEST, prince of *Saxe-Gotha*, ſurnamed the *Pious* [k]. MUSÆUS, a man of ſuperior learning and exquiſite penetration and judgment, adopted ſo far the ſentiments of CALIXTUS, as to maintain, that *good works* might, in a certain ſenſe, be conſidered as *neceſſary to ſalvation*; and that of the erroneous doctrines imputed to this eminent man, ſeveral were of little or no importance. It is very probable, that the followers of CALIXTUS would have willingly ſubmitted this whole controverſy to the arbitration of ſuch candid and impartial judges. But this laudable moderation offended ſo highly the Saxon doctors, that they began to ſuſpect the academy of *Jena* of ſeveral erroneous opinions, and marked out MUSÆUS, in a particular manner, as a perſon who had, in many reſpects, apoſtatized from the true and orthodox faith [l].

[*i*] See CHRISTOPHER HARTKONCH's *Church-Hiſtory of Pruſſia* (written in German), book ii. chap. x. p. 602.—MOLERI, *Cimbria Literata*, tom. iii. p. 150.—See alſo the *Acts* and *Documents* contained in the famous collection, entitled, *Unſculidge Nachrichten*, A. 1740, p. 144. A. 1742, p. 29. A. 1745, p. 91.

The riſe of the controverſy relating to Pietiſm.

XXVI. Theſe debates were ſuppreſſed and ſucceeded by new commotions, that aroſe in the church, and are commonly known under the denomination of the *Pietiſtical Controverſy.* This controverſy was owing to the zeal of a certain ſet of perſons, who, no doubt, with pious and upright intentions, endeavoured to ſtem the torrent of vice and corruption, and to reform the licentious manners both of the clergy and the people. But, as the beſt things may be abuſed, ſo this reforming ſpirit inflamed perſons that were but ill qualified to exert it with wiſdom and ſucceſs. Many, deluded by the ſuggeſtions of an irregular imagination, and an ill-informed underſtanding, or guided by principles and views of a ſtill more criminal nature, ſpread abroad new and ſingular opinions, falſe viſions, unintelligible maxims, auſtere precepts, and imprudent clamours againſt the diſcipline of the church; all which excited the moſt dreadful tumults, and kindled the flames of contention and diſcord.[r] The commencement of *Pietiſm* was indeed laudable and decent. It was ſet on foot by the pious and learned SPENER, who, by the private ſocieties he formed at *Francfort*, with a deſign to promote vital religion, rouzed the lukewarm from their indifference, and excited a ſpirit of vigour and reſolution in thoſe who had been ſatisfied to lament, in ſilence, the progreſs of impiety. The remarkable effect of theſe pious meetings was increaſed by a book publiſhed by this well-meaning man, under the title of *Pious Deſires*, in which he exhibited a ſtriking view of the diſorders of the church, and propoſed the remedies that were proper to heal them. Many perſons of good and upright intentions were highly pleaſed both with the proceedings and writings of SPENER, and indeed the greateſt part of thoſe, who had the cauſe of virtue and practical religion truly at heart, applauded the deſigns of this good man, though an apprehenſion of abuſes retained numbers from encouraging them openly. Theſe abuſes actually happened. The remedies propoſed by SPENER to heal the diſorders of the church fell into unſkilful hands, were adminiſtered without ſagacity or prudence, and thus, in many caſes, proved to be worſe than the diſeaſe itſelf. The religious meetings abovementioned (or the *Colleges of Piety*, as they were uſually called by a phraſe borrowed from the Dutch), tended in many places to kindle in the breaſts of the multitude the flames of a blind and intemperate zeal, whoſe effects were impetuous and violent, inſtead of that pure and rational love of God, whoſe fruits are benign and peaceful. Hence complaints aroſe againſt theſe inſtitutions of *Pietiſm*, as if, under a ſtriking appearance of ſanctity, they led the people into falſe notions of religion, and fomented, in thoſe who were of a turbulent and violent character, the ſeeds and principles of mutiny and ſedition.

---

[k] This piece, which was written in German, did not appear in public till after the death of GLASSIUS, in the year 1662; a ſecond edition of it was publiſhed in 8vo at *Jena* ſome years ago. The piece exhibits a rare and ſhining inſtance of theological moderation; and is worthy of a ſerious and attentive peruſal.

[l] For an account of the imputations caſt upon the divines of *Jena*, and more eſpecially on MUSÆUS, ſee a judicious and ſolid work of the latter, entitled, *Der Jeniſchen Theologen Auſfuhrlicke Erklarung*, &c.—See alſo Jo. GEORGII WALCHII *Introductio in Controverſias Eccleſiæ Lutheranæ*, vol. i. p. 405.

The commotions at *Leipſic.*

XXVII. Theſe firſt complaints would have been undoubtedly huſhed, and the tumults they occaſioned would have ſubſided by degrees, had not the conteſts that aroſe at *Leipſic*, in the year 1689, added fuel to the flame. Certain pious and learned profeſſors of philoſophy, and particularly FRANCKIUS, SCHADIUS, and PAULUS ANTONIUS, the diſciples of SPENER, who at that time was eccleſiaſtical ſuperintendent of the court of *Saxony*, began to conſider with attention the defects that prevailed in the ordinary method of inſtructing the candidates for the miniſtry; and this review perſuaded them of the neceſſity of uſing their beſt endeavours to ſupply what was wanting, and to correct what was amiſs. For this purpoſe, they undertook to explain in their colleges certain books of holy Scripture, in order to render theſe genuine ſources of religious knowledge better underſtood, and to promote a ſpirit of practical piety and vital religion in the minds of their hearers. The novelty of this method drew attention, and rendered it ſingularly pleaſing to many; accordingly, theſe lectures were much frequented, and their effects were viſible in the lives and converſations of ſeveral perſons, whom they ſeemed to inſpire with a deep ſenſe of the importance of religion and virtue. Whether theſe firſt effuſions of religious fervour, which were, in themſelves, moſt certainly laudable, were always kept within the ſtrict bounds of reaſon and diſcretion, is a queſtion not eaſily decided. If we are to believe the report of common fame, and the teſtimonies of ſeveral perſons of great weight, this was by no means the caſe; and many things were both ſaid and done in theſe *Biblical Colleges* (as they were called), which though they might be looked upon, by equitable and candid judges, as worthy of toleration and indulgence, were, nevertheleſs, contrary to cuſtom, and far from being conſiſtent with prudence. Hence rumours were ſpread, tumults excited, animoſities kindled, and the matter at length brought to a public trial, in which the pious and learned men above mentioned were, indeed, declared free from the errors and hereſies that had been laid to their charge, but were, at the ſame time, prohibited from carrying on the plan of religious inſtruction they had undertaken with ſuch zeal. It was during theſe troubles and diviſions that the invidious denomination of *Pietiſts* was firſt invented; it may, at leaſt, be affirmed, that it was not commonly known before this period. It was at firſt applied by ſome giddy and inconſiderate perſons to thoſe who frequented the *Biblical Colleges*, and lived in a manner ſuitable to the inſtructions and exhortations that were addreſſed to them in theſe ſeminaries of piety. It was afterwards made uſe of to characterize all thoſe who were either diſtinguiſhed by the exceſſive auſterity of their manners, or who, regardleſs of *truth* and *opinion*, were only intent upon *practice*, and turned the whole vigour of their efforts towards the attainment of religious feelings and habits. But as it is the fate of all thoſe denominations by which peculiar ſects are diſtinguiſhed, to be variouſly and often very improperly applied, ſo the title of *Pietiſts* was frequently given, in common converſation, to perſons of eminent wiſdom and ſanctity, who were equally remarkable for their adherence to truth and their love of piety; and, not ſeldom, to perſons whoſe motley characters exhibited an enormous mixture of profligacy and enthuſiaſm, and who deſerved the title of delirious fanatics better than any other denomination.

The progreſs of theſe debates.

XXVIII. This conteſt was by no means confined to *Leipſic*, but diffuſed its contagion, with incredible celerity, through all the Lutheran churches in the different ſtates and kingdoms of *Europe*. For, from this time, in all the cities, towns, and villages, where Lutheraniſm was profeſſed, there ſtarted up, all of a ſudden, perſons of various ranks and profeſſions, of both ſexes, learned and illiterate, who declared, that they were called, by a *divine impulſe*, to pull up iniquity by the root, to reſtore to its primitive luſtre, and propagate through the world, the declining cauſe of piety and virtue, to govern the church of CHRIST by wiſer rules than thoſe by which it was at preſent directed, and who, partly in their writings, and partly in their private and public diſcourſes, pointed out the means and meaſures that were neceſſary to bring about this important revolution. All thoſe, who were ſtruck with this imaginary *impulſe*, unanimouſly agreed, that nothing could have a more powerful tendency to propagate among the multitude ſolid knowledge, pious feelings, and holy habits, than thoſe private meetings that had been firſt contrived by SPENER, and that were afterwards introduced into *Leipſic.* Several religious aſſemblies were accordingly formed in various places, which, though they differed in ſome circumſtances, and were not all conducted and compoſed with equal wiſdom, piety, and prudence, were, however, deſigned to promote the ſame general purpoſe. In the mean time, theſe unuſual, irregular, and tumultuous proceedings filled, with uneaſy and alarming apprehenſions, both thoſe who were intruſted with the government of the church, and thoſe who ſat at the helm of the ſtate. Theſe apprehenſions were juſtified by this important conſideration, that the pious and well-meaning perſons, who compoſed theſe aſſemblies, had indiſcreetly admitted into their community a parcel of extravagant and hot-headed fanatics, who foretold the approaching deſtruction of *Babel* (by which they meant the Lutheran church), terrified the populace with fictitious viſions, aſſumed the authority of prophets honoured with a divine commiſſion, obſcured the ſublime truths of religion by a gloomy kind of jargon of their own invention, and revived doctrines that had long before been condemned by the church. Theſe enthuſiaſts alſo aſſerted, that the *millennium*, or thouſand years reign of the ſaints on earth, mentioned by St. JOHN, was near at hand. They endeavoured to overturn the wiſeſt eſtabliſhments, and to deſtroy the beſt inſtitutions, and deſired that the power of preaching and adminiſtering public inſtruction might be given promiſcuouſly to all ſorts of perſons. Thus was the Lutheran church torn aſunder in the moſt deplorable manner, while the votaries of *Rome* ſtood by and beheld, with a ſecret ſatisfaction, theſe unhappy diviſions. The moſt violent debates aroſe in all the Lutheran churches; and perſons, whoſe differences were occaſioned rather by mere words, and queſtions of little conſequence, than by any doctrines or inſtitutions of conſiderable importance, attacked one another with the bittereſt animoſity; and, in many countries, ſevere laws were at length enacted againſt the *Pietiſts* [*m*].

The debates carried on with Spener and the divines of *Hall*.

XXIX. Theſe revivers of piety were of two kinds, who, by their different manner of proceeding, deſerve to be placed in two diſtinct claſſes. One ſect of theſe practical reformers propoſed to carry on their plan without introducing any change into the doctrine, diſcipline, or form of government that were eſtabliſhed in the Lutheran church. The other maintained, on the contrary, that it was impoſſible to promote the progreſs of real piety among the Lutherans, without making conſiderable alterations in their doctrine, and changing the whole form of their eccleſiaſtical diſcipline and polity. The former had at their head the learned and pious SPENER, who, in the year 1691, removed from *Dreſden* to *Berlin*, and whoſe ſentiments were adopted by the profeſſors of the new academy at *Hall*; and particularly by FRANCKIUS and PAULUS ANTONIUS, who had been invited thither from *Leipſic*, where they began to be ſuſpected of *Pietiſm*. Though few pretended to treat either with indignation or contempt the intentions and purpoſe of theſe good men (which, indeed, none could deſpiſe without affecting to appear the enemy of practical religion and virtue), yet many eminent divines, and more eſpecially the profeſſors and paſtors of *Wittemberg*, were of opinion, that, in the execution of this laudable purpoſe, ſeveral maxims were adopted, and certain meaſures employed, that were prejudicial to the truth, and alſo detrimental to the intereſts of the church. Hence they looked on themſelves as obliged to proceed publicly, firſt againſt SPENER, in the year 1695, and afterwards againſt his diſciples and adherents, as the inventors and promoters of erroneous and dangerous opinions. Theſe debates are of a recent date; ſo that thoſe who are deſirous of knowing more particularly how far the principles of equity, moderation, and candour influenced the conduct and directed the proceedings of the contending parties, may eaſily receive a ſatisfactory information.

[*m*] This whole matter is amply illuſtrated by the learned JO. GEORGE WALCHIUS, in his *Introductio ad Controverſias*, vol. ii. and iii. who exhibits, ſucceſſively, the various ſcenes of this deplorable conteſt, with a view of the principal points that were controverted, and his judgment concerning each, and a particular account of the writers that diſplayed their talents on this occaſion. It would, indeed, be difficult for any one man to give an ample and exact hiſtory of this conteſt, which was accompanied with ſo many incidental circumſtances, and was, upon the whole, of ſuch a tedious and complicated nature. It were therefore to be wiſhed, that a ſociety of prudent and impartial perſons, furniſhed with a competent knowledge of human nature and political tranſactions, and alſo with proper materials, would ſet themſelves to compoſe the hiſtory of *Pietiſm*. If ſeveral perſons were employed in collecting from public records, and alſo from papers that lie yet concealed in the cabinets of the curious, the events which happened in each country where this controverſy reigned; and if theſe materials, thus carefully gathered on the ſpot, were put in the hands of a man capable of digeſting the whole; this would produce a moſt intereſting and uſeful hiſtory.

The ſubject of theſe debates.

XXX. Theſe debates turned upon a variety of points; and therefore the matter of them cannot be comprehended under any one general head. If we conſider them indeed in relation to their origin, and the circumſtances that gave riſe to them, we ſhall then be able to reduce them to ſome fixed principles. It is well known, that thoſe who had the advancement of piety moſt zealouſly at heart, were poſſeſſed of a notion, that no order of men contributed more to retard its progreſs than the clergy, whoſe peculiar vocation it was to inculcate and promote it. Looking upon this as the root of the evil, it was but natural that their plans of reformation ſhould begin here; and, accordingly, they laid it down as an eſſential principle, that none ſhould be admitted into the miniſtry, but ſuch as had received a proper education, were diſtinguiſhed by their wiſdom and ſanctity of manners, and had hearts filled with *divine love*. Hence they propoſed, in the *firſt place*, a thorough reformation of the ſchools of divinity; and they explained clearly enough what they meant by this reformation, which conſiſted in the following points: That the ſyſtematical theology, which reigned in the academies, and was compoſed of intricate and diſputable doctrines, and obſcure and unuſual forms of expreſſion, ſhould be totally aboliſhed;—that polemical divinity, which comprehended the controverſies ſubſiſting between Chriſtians of different communions, ſhould be leſs eagerly ſtudied, and leſs frequently treated, though not entirely neglected;—that all mixture of philoſophy and human learning with divine wiſdom was to be moſt carefully avoided;—that, on the contrary, all thoſe who were deſigned for the miniſtry, ſhould be accuſtomed, from their early youth, to the peruſal and ſtudy of the holy Scriptures;—that they ſhould be taught a plain ſyſtem of theology, drawn from theſe unerring ſources of truth;—and that the whole courſe of their education was to be ſo directed, as to render them uſeful in life, by the practical power of their doctrine and the commanding influence of their example. As theſe maxims were propagated with the greateſt induſtry and zeal, and were explained inadvertently by ſome, without thoſe reſtrictions which prudence ſeemed to require; theſe profeſſed patrons and revivers of piety were ſuſpected of deſigns that could not but render them obnoxious to cenſure. They were ſuppoſed to deſpiſe philoſophy and learning, to treat with indifference, and even to renounce, all inquiries into the nature and foundations of religious truth, to diſapprove of the zeal and labours of thoſe who defended it againſt ſuch as either corrupted or oppoſed it, and to place the whole of *their* theology in certain vague and incoherent declamations concerning the duties of morality. Hence aroſe thoſe famous diſputes concerning the uſe of philoſophy and the value of human learning, conſidered in connection with the intereſts of religion—the dignity and uſefulneſs of *ſyſtematic* theology—the neceſſity of polemic divinity—the excellence of the myſtic ſyſtem—and alſo concerning the true method of inſtructing the people.

The *ſecond* great object, that employed the zeal and attention of the perſons now under conſideration, was, that the candidates for the miniſtry ſhould not only, for the future, receive ſuch an academical education as would tend rather to ſolid utility than to mere ſpeculation; but alſo that they ſhould *dedicate themſelves to God* in a peculiar manner, and exhibit the moſt ſtriking examples of piety and virtue. This maxim, which, when conſidered in itſelf, muſt be acknowledged to be highly laudable, not only gave occaſion to ſeveral new regulations, deſigned to reſtrain the paſſions of the ſtudious youth, to inſpire them with pious ſentiments, and to excite in them holy reſolutions; but alſo produced another maxim, which was a laſting ſource of controverſy and debate, *viz.* "that no perſon, that was not himſelf a model of "piety and divine love, was qualified to be a "public teacher of piety, or a guide to others in "the way of ſalvation." This opinion was conſidered by many as derogatory from the power and efficacy of the word of God, which cannot be deprived of its divine influence by the vices of its miniſters; and as a ſort of revival of the long-exploded errors of the Donatiſts: and what rendered it peculiarly liable to an interpretation of this nature was, the imprudence of ſome Pietiſts, who inculcated and explained it, without thoſe reſtrictions that were neceſſary to render it unexceptionable. Hence aroſe endleſs and intricate debates concerning the following queſtions: "whether the "religious knowledge acquired by a wicked man "can be termed theology?"—"whether a vicious "perſon can, in effect, attain to a true knowledge "of religion?"—"how far the office and miniſtry "of an impious eccleſiaſtic can be pronounced "ſalutary and efficacious?"—"whether a licen-"tious and ungodly man cannot be ſuſceptible "of illumination?"—and other queſtions of a like nature.

XXXI. Theſe revivers of declining piety went yet further. In order to render the miniſtry of their paſtors as ſucceſsful as poſſible, in rouſing men from their indolence, and in ſtemming the torrent of corruption and immorality, they judged two things indiſpenſably neceſſary. The *firſt* was, to ſuppreſs entirely, in the courſe of public inſtruction, and more eſpecially in that delivered from the pulpit, certain maxims and phraſes which the corruption of men leads them frequently to interpret in a manner favourable to the indulgence of their paſſions. Such, in the judgment of the Pietiſts, were the following propoſitions: *No man is able to attain to that perfection which the divine law requires—good works are not neceſſary to ſalvation—in the act of juſtification, on the part of man, faith alone is concerned, without good works.* Many, however, were apprehenſive, that, by the ſuppreſſion of theſe propoſitions, truth itſelf muſt ſuffer deeply: and that the Chriſtian religion, deprived thus of its peculiar doctrines, would be expoſed, naked and defenceleſs, to the attacks of its adverſaries. The *ſecond* ſtep they took, in order to give efficacy to their plans of reformation, was to form new rules of life and manners, much more rigorous and auſtere than thoſe which had been formerly practiſed; and to place in the claſs of *ſinful* and *unlawful* gratifications ſeveral kinds of pleaſure and amuſement, which had hitherto been looked upon as innocent in themſelves, and which could only become *good* or *evil* in conſequence of the reſpective characters of thoſe who uſed them with prudence, or abuſed them with intemperance. Thus, dancing, pantomimes, public ſports, theatrical diverſions, the reading of humorous and comical books, with ſeveral other kinds of pleaſure and entertainment, were prohibited by the Pietiſts, as unlawful and unſeemly; and, therefore, by no means of an indifferent nature. Many, however, thought this rule of moral diſcipline by far too rigid and ſevere; and thus was revived the ancient conteſt of the ſchoolmen, concerning the famous queſtion, *whether any human actions are truly indifferent?* i. e. equally removed from moral good on the one hand, and from moral evil on the other; and *whether*, on the contrary, it be not true, that *all actions, whatever, muſt be either conſidered as good, or as evil?* The diſcuſſion of this queſtion was attended with a variety of debates upon the ſeveral points of the prohibition now mentioned; and theſe debates were often carried on with animoſity and bitterneſs, and very rarely with that preciſion, temper, and judgment that the nicety of the matters in diſpute required. The *third* thing, on which the *Pietiſts* inſiſted, was, that beſides the ſtated meetings for public worſhip, private aſſemblies ſhould be held for prayer and other religious exerciſes. But many were of opinion, that the cauſe of true piety and virtue was rather endangered than promoted by theſe aſſemblies; and experience and obſervation ſeemed to confirm this opinion. It would be both endleſs and unneceſſary to enumerate all the little diſputes that aroſe from the appointment of theſe private aſſemblies, and, in general, from the notions entertained, and the meaſures purſued by the *Pietiſts* [n]. It is nevertheleſs proper to obſerve, that the lenity and indulgence ſhewn by theſe people to perſons whoſe opinions were erroneous, and whoſe errors were, by no means, of an indifferent nature, irritated their adverſaries to a very high degree, and made many ſuſpect, that the *Pietiſts* laid a much greater ſtreſs upon practice than upon belief, and, ſeparating what ought ever to be inſeparably joined together, held virtuous manners in higher eſteem than religious truth. Amidſt the prodigious numbers that appeared in theſe controverſies, it was not at all ſurpriſing, if the variety of their characters, capacities, and views, be duly conſidered, that ſome were chargeable with imprudence, others with intemperate zeal, and that many, to avoid what they looked upon as unlawful, fell injudiciouſly into the oppoſite extreme.

These reſtorers of vital religion endeavour to promote piety at the expence of truth.

XXXII. The other claſs of Pietiſts already mentioned, whoſe reforming views extended ſo far, as to change the ſyſtem of doctrine and the form of eccleſiaſtical government that were eſtabliſhed in the Lutheran church, comprehended perſons of various characters and different ways of thinking. Some of them were totally deſtitute of reaſon and judgment; their errors were the reveries of a diſordered brain; and they were rather to be conſidered as lunatics than as heretics.

---

[n] Theſe debates were firſt collected, and alſo needleſsly multiplied, by SCHELGVIGIUS, in his *Synopſis Controverſiarum ſub pietatis prætextu motarum*, which was publiſhed in the year 1701, in 8vo. The reader will alſo find the arguments, uſed by the contending parties in this diſpute, judiciouſly ſummed up in two different works of LANGIUS, the one entitled, *Antibarbarus*; and the other the *Middle-way*; the former compoſed in Latin, the latter in German.—See alſo the TIMOTHEUS VERINUS of VAL. ERN. LOSCHERUS.

Others were leſs extravagant, and tempered the ſingular notions, they had derived from reading or meditation, with a certain mixture of the important truths and doctrines of religion. We ſhall mention but a few perſons of this claſs, and thoſe only who were diſtinguiſhed from the reſt by their ſuperior merit and reputation.

Among theſe was GODFREY ARNOLD, a native of *Saxony*, a man of extenſive reading, tolerable parts, and richly endowed with that natural and unaffected eloquence, which is ſo wonderfully adapted to touch and to perſuade. This man diſturbed the tranquillity of the church towards the concluſion of this century, by a variety of theological productions, that were full of new and ſingular opinions; and more eſpecially by his *eccleſiaſtical hiſtory*, which he had the aſſurance to impoſe upon the public, as a work compoſed with candour and impartiality. His natural complexion was dark, melancholy, and auſtere; and theſe ſeeds of fanaticiſm were ſo expanded and nouriſhed by the peruſal of the *Myſtic* writers, that the flame of enthuſiaſm was kindled in his breaſt and broke forth in his conduct and writings with peculiar vehemence. He looked upon the *Myſtics* as ſuperior to all other writers, nay as the only depoſitaries of true wiſdom; reduced the whole of religion to certain internal *feelings* and *motions*, of which it is difficult to form a juſt idea; neglected entirely the ſtudy of truth; and employed the whole power of his genius and eloquence in enumerating, deploring, and exaggerating, the vices and corruptions of human nature. If it is univerſally allowed to be the firſt and moſt eſſential obligation of an hiſtorian to avoid all appearance of partiality, and neither to be influenced by perſonal attachments nor by private reſentment in the recital of facts, it muſt be fairly acknowledged, that no man could be leſs fit for writing hiſtory than ARNOLD. His whole hiſtory, as every one muſt ſee who looks into it with the ſmalleſt degree of attention, is the production of a violent ſpirit, and is dictated by a vehement antipathy againſt the doctrines and inſtitutions of the Lutheran church. One of the fundamental principles that influences the judgment, and directs the opinions and deciſions of this hiſtorian, throughout the whole courſe of his work, is, that all the abuſes and corruptions that have found admittance into the church ſince the time of the apoſtles, have been introduced by its miniſters and rulers, men of vicious and abandoned characters. From this principle, he draws the following goodly conſequence: that all thoſe who oppoſed the meaſures of the clergy, or felt their reſentment, were perſons of diſtinguiſhed ſanctity and virtue; and that ſuch, on the contrary, as either favoured the miniſters of the church, or were favoured by them, were ſtrangers to the ſpirit of true and genuine piety. Hence proceeded ARNOLD's unaccountable partiality in favour of almoſt all that bore the denomination of *Heretics* [o]; whom he defended with the utmoſt zeal, without having always underſtood their doctrine, and, in ſome caſes, without having even examined their arguments. This partiality was highly detrimental to his reputation, and rendered his hiſtory peculiarly obnoxious to cenſure. He did not, however, continue in this way of thinking; but as he advanced in years and experience, perceived the errors into which he had been led by the impetuoſity of his paſſions and the contagious influence of pernicious examples.

☞ [o] ARNOLD's Hiſtory is thus entitled, *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtica et Heretica*. Dr. MOSHEIM's account of this learned man is drawn up with much ſeverity, and perhaps is not entirely deſtitute of partiality. See the Life of ARNOLD in the *General Dictionary*.

This ſenſe of his miſtakes corrected the vehemence of his natural temper and the turbulence of his party ſpirit, ſo that, as we learn from witneſſes, worthy of credit, he became at laſt a lover of truth and a pattern of moderation [p].

Dippelius.

XXXIII. ARNOLD was far ſurpaſſed in fanatical malignity and inſolence by JOHN CONRAD DIPPELIUS, a Heſſian divine, who aſſumed the denomination of the *Chriſtian Democritus*, inflamed the minds of the ſimple by a variety of productions, and excited conſiderable tumults and commotions towards the concluſion of this century. This vain, ſupercilious, and arrogant doctor, who ſeemed formed by nature for a ſatyriſt and a buffoon, inſtead of propoſing any new ſyſtem of religious doctrine and diſcipline, was ſolely employed in overturning thoſe that were received in the Proteſtant church. His days were principally ſpent in throwing out ſarcaſms and invectives againſt all denominations of Chriſtians; and the Lutherans, to whoſe communion he belonged, were more eſpecially the objects of his raillery and deriſion, which, on many occaſions, ſpared not thoſe things that had formerly been looked upon as the moſt reſpectable and ſacred. It is much to be doubted, whether he had formed any clear and diſtinct notions of the doctrines he taught; ſince, in his views of things, the power of imagination domineered evidently over the dictates of right reaſon and common ſenſe. But, if he really underſtood the religious maxims he was propagating, he had not certainly the talent of rendering them clear and perſpicuous to others; for nothing can be more ambiguous and obſcure than the expreſſions under which they are conveyed, and the arguments by which they are ſupported.

---

[p] See COLERI *Vita* ARNOLDI.—*Nouveau Diction. Hiſtor. et Critique*, tom. i. p. 485.

A man muſt have the gift of divination, to be able to deduce a regular and conſiſtent ſyſtem of doctrine from the various productions of this incoherent and unintelligible writer, who was a chemiſt into the bargain, and whoſe brain ſeems to have been heated into a high degree of fermentation by the fire of the elaboratory. If the rude, motley, and ſarcaſtical writings of this wrong-headed reformer ſhould reach poſterity, it will be certainly a juſt matter of ſurpriſe to our deſcendants, that a conſiderable number of their anceſtors ſhould have been ſo blind as to chuſe for a model of genuine piety, and a teacher of religion, a man who had audaciouſly violated the firſt and moſt eſſential principles of ſolid piety and ſound ſenſe [q].

The inventions and reveries of Peterſen.

XXXIV. The mild and gentle temper of JOHN WILLIAM PETERSEN, miniſter and firſt member of the eccleſiaſtical conſiſtory of *Lunenburg*, diſtinguiſhed him remarkably from the fiery enthuſiaſt now mentioned. But the mildneſs of this good-natured eccleſiaſtic was accompanied with a want of reſolution, that might be called weakneſs, and a certain floridneſs and warmth of imagination, that rendered him peculiarly ſuſceptible of illuſion himſelf, and every way proper to lead others innocently into error. Of this he gave a very remarkable ſpecimen in the year 1691, by maintaining publicly that ROSAMOND JULIANA, Counteſs of *Aſſeburg* (whoſe diſordered brain ſuggeſted to her the moſt romantic and chimerical notions) was honoured with a viſion of the Deity, and commiſſioned to make a new declaration of his will to mankind. He alſo revived and propagated openly the obſolete doctrine of the *Millennium*, which ROSAMOND had confirmed by her pretended authority from above. This firſt error produced many; for error is fertile, eſpecially in thoſe minds where imagination has ſpurned the yoke of reaſon, and conſiders all its airy viſions as ſolid and important diſcoveries. Accordingly, PETERSEN went about propheſying with his wife [r], who alſo gave herſelf out for a kind of oracle, and boaſted of her extenſive knowledge of the ſecrets of heaven. They talked of a general *reſtitution* of all things, at which grand and ſolemn period all intelligent beings were to be reſtored to happineſs, the gates of hell opened, and wicked men, together with evil ſpirits, delivered from the guilt, power, and puniſhment of ſin. They ſuppoſed that two *diſtinct natures*, and both of them *human*, were united in CHRIST; one aſſumed in heaven before the reformation of this globe, the other derived, upon earth, from the Virgin MARY. Theſe opinions were ſwallowed down by many among the multitude, and were embraced by ſome of ſuperior rank; they met, however, with great oppoſition, and were refuted by a conſiderable number of writers, to whom PETERSEN, who was amply furniſhed with leiſure and eloquence, made voluminous replies. In the year 1692, he was at length depoſed; and, from that period, paſſed his days in the tranquillity of a rural retreat in the territory of *Magdeburg*, where he cheered his ſolitude by epiſtolary commerce, and ſpent the remainder of his days in compoſition and ſtudy [s].

---

[q] His works were all publiſhed, in the year 1747, in five volumes in 4to; and his memory is ſtill highly honoured and reſpected by many, who conſider him as having been, in his day, an eminent teacher of true piety and wiſdom. No kind of authors find ſuch zealous readers and patrons as thoſe who deal largely in invective, and ſwell themſelves, by a vain ſelf-ſufficiency, into an imagined ſuperiority over the reſt of mankind. Beſides, DIPPELIUS was an excellent chemiſt and a good phyſician; and this procured him many friends and admirers, as all men are fond of riches and long life, and theſe two ſciences were ſuppoſed to lead to the one and to the other.

---

[r] Her name was JOHANNA ELEONORA à MERLAU.

Schade and Boſius.

XXXV. It is not eaſy to determine, whether JOHN CASPAR SCHADE and GEORGE BOSIUS may be aſſociated properly with the perſons now mentioned. They were both good men, full of zeal for the happineſs and ſalvation of their brethren; but their zeal was neither directed by prudence, nor tempered with moderation. The former, who was miniſter at *Berlin*, propagated ſeveral notions that ſeemed crude and uncouth; and, in the year 1697, inveighed, with the greateſt bitterneſs, againſt the cuſtom that prevails in the Lutheran church of confeſſing privately to the clergy. Theſe violent remonſtrances excited great commotions, and were even attended with popular tumults. BOSIUS performed the paſtoral functions at *Soraw*; and, to awaken ſinners from their ſecurity, and prevent their treating, with negligence and indifference, intereſts that are moſt important by being eternal, denied that God would continue always propitious and placable with reſpect to thoſe offenders, whoſe incorrigible obſtinacy he had foreſeen from all eternity; or that he would offer them beyond a certain period, marked in his decrees, thoſe ſuccours of grace that are neceſſary to ſalvation. This tenet, in the judgment of many grave divines, ſeemed highly injurious to the boundleſs mercy of God, and was accordingly refuted and condemned in ſeveral treatiſes; it found, nevertheleſs, an eminent patron and defender in the learned RECHENBELG, profeſſor of divinity at *Leipſic*, not to mention others of leſs note, who appeared in its behalf [t].

---

[s] PETERSEN wrote his life in German, and it was firſt publiſhed in 8vo. in 1717.—His wife added her Life to it, by way of ſupplement, in the year 1718. Theſe pieces of biography will ſatisfy ſuch as are deſirous of a particular account of the character, manners, and talents, of this extraordinary pair. For an account of the troubles they excited at *Lunenburg*, ſee JO. MOLLERI, *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 639. the *Unſchuldige Nachrichten*, A. 1748. p. 974. A. 1749. p. 30—200, & paſſim.

Conteſts concerning the omnipreſence of Chriſt's fleſh, between the doctors of *Tubingen* and *Gieſſen*.

XXXVI. Among the controverſies of inferior note that divided the Lutheran church, we ſhall firſt mention thoſe that broke out between the doctors of *Tubingen* and *Gieſſen* ſo early as the year 1616. The principal part of this debate related to the abaſement and humiliation, or, to what divines call, the *exinanition* of *Jeſus Chriſt*; and the great point was to know in what this *exinanition* properly conſiſted, and what was the preciſe nature and characteriſtic of this ſingular ſituation: That the *Man Chriſt* poſſeſſed, even in the moſt dreadful periods of his abaſement, the divine properties and attributes he had received in conſequence of the *hypoſtatic union*, was unanimouſly agreed on by both of the contending parties; but they differed in their ſentiments relating to this ſubtile and intricate queſtion, *Whether Chriſt, during his mediatorial ſufferings and ſacerdotal ſtate, really ſuſpended the exertion of theſe attributes, or only concealed this exertion from the view of mortals?* The latter was maintained by the doctors of *Tubingen*, while thoſe of *Gieſſen* were inclined to think, that the exertion of the divine attributes was *really* ſuſpended in CHRIST during his humiliation and ſufferings. This main queſtion was followed by others, which were much more ſubtile than important, concerning the *manner* in which God is *preſent* with all his works, the reaſons and foundation of this univerſal preſence, the true cauſe of the omnipreſence of CHRIST's body, and others of a like intricate and unintelligible nature. The champions that diſtinguiſhed themſelves on the ſide of the doctors of *Tubin-*

---

[t] See WALCHIUS's *Introductio ad Controverſias*, p. I. cap. iv.

gen were, Lucas Osiander, Melchior Nicolas, and Theodore Thummius. The moſt eminent of thoſe that adopted the cauſe of the divines of *Gieſſen* were, Balthazar, Menzer, and Justus Feverborn. The conteſt was carried on with zeal, learning, and ſagacity; it were to be wiſhed that one could add, that it was managed with wiſdom, dignity, and moderation. This, indeed, was far from being the caſe; but ſuch was the ſpirit and genius of the age, that many things were now treated with indulgence, or beheld with approbation, which the wiſdom and decency of ſucceeding times have juſtly endeavoured to diſcountenance and correct. In order to terminate theſe diſagreeable conteſts, the Saxon divines were commanded, by their ſovereign, to offer themſelves as arbitrators between the contending parties in the year 1624; their arbitration was accepted, but it did not at all contribute to decide the matters in debate. Their deciſions were vague and ambiguous, and were therefore adapted to ſatisfy none of the parties. They declared, that they could not entirely approve of the doctrine of either; but inſinuated, at the ſame time, that a certain degree of preference was due to the opinions maintained by the doctors of *Gieſſen* [u]. Thoſe of *Tubingen* rejected the deciſion of the Saxon arbitrators; and it is very probable, that the divines of *Gieſſen* would have appealed from it alſo, had not the public calamities, in which *Germany* began to be involved at this time, ſuſpended this miſerable conteſt, by impoſing ſilence upon the diſputants, and leaving them in the quiet poſſeſſion of their reſpective opinions.

---

[u] Jo. Wolf. Jaeger. *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. et Polit. Sæc.* xvii. *Decenn.* iii. p. 329.—Christ. Eberh. Weismanni *Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſt. Sæc.* xvii. p. 1178.—Walchius, *loc. cit.* p. 206.—See alſo Caroli Arnold, and the other writers, who have written the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of theſe times.

The controverſy occaſioned by the writings of Rathmannus.

XXXVII. Before the ceſſation of the controverſy now mentioned, a new one was occaſioned, in the year 1621, by the writings of HERMAN RATHMAN, miniſter at *Dantzic*, a man of eminent piety, ſome learning, and a zealous patron and admirer of ARNDT'S famous book concerning *true Chriſtianity*. This good man was ſuſpected by his colleague CORVINUS, and ſeveral others, of entertaining ſentiments derogatory from the dignity and power of the ſacred writings. Theſe ſuſpicions they derived from a book he publiſhed, in the year 1621, *Concerning Chriſt's Kingdom of Grace*, which, according to the repreſentations of his adverſaries, contained the following doctrine: "That the word of God, as it ſtands in the ſacred writings, hath no *innate* power to illuminate "the mind, to excite in it a principle of regeneration, and thus to turn it to God; that the external "*word* ſheweth, indeed, the way to ſalvation, but "cannot *effectually* lead men to it; but that God "himſelf, by the miniſtry of another, and an "*internal word*, works ſuch a change in the minds "of men, as is neceſſary to render them agreeable "in his ſight, and enables them to pleaſe him "by their words and actions." This doctrine was repreſented by CORVINUS and his aſſociates as the ſame which had been formerly held by SCHWENCKFELD, and was profeſſed by the Myſtics in general. But whoever will be at the pains to examine with attention the various writings of RATHMAN on this ſubject, muſt ſoon be convinced, that his adverſaries either miſunderſtood his true ſentiments, or wilfully miſrepreſented them. His real doctrine may be compriſed in the four following points: "*Firſt*, that the divine word, "contained in the Holy Scriptures, is endowed "with the power of healing the minds of men,

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART II.

"and bringing them to God: but that, *ſecondly*, "cannot exert this power in the minds of corrupt "men, who reſiſt its divine operation and influ"ence; and that of conſequence, *thirdly*, it is ab"ſolutely neceſſary, that the word be preceded or "accompanied by ſome divine energy, which may "prepare the minds of ſinners to receive it, and "remove thoſe impediments that oppoſe its effi"cacy; and *fourthly*, that it is by the power of the "*holy ſpirit*, or *internal word*, that the external "word is rendered incapable of exerting its effi"cacy in enlightening and ſanctifying the minds "of men [w]." There is, indeed, ſome difference between theſe opinions and the doctrine commonly received in the Lutheran church, relating to the efficacy of the divine word; but a careful peruſal of the writings of RATHMAN on this ſubject, and a candid examination of his inaccurate expreſſions, will perſuade the impartial reader, that this difference is neither great nor important; and he will only perceive, that this pious man had not the talent of expreſſing his notions with order, perſpicuity, and preciſion. However that may have been, this conteſt grew more general from day to day, and, at length, extended its polemic influence through the whole Lutheran church, the greateſt part of whoſe members followed the example of the Saxon doctors in condemning RATHMAN, while a conſiderable number, ſtruck with the luſtre of his piety, and perſuaded of the innocence of his doctrine, eſpouſed his cauſe. In the year 1628, when this controverſy was at the greateſt height, RATHMAN died, and then the warmth and animoſity of the contending parties ſubſided gradually, and at length ceaſed.

---

[w] See MOLLERU's *Cimbria Literata*, tom. iii. p. 559.— HARKNOCH's German work, entitled *Preuſſiſche Kirchen-Geſchichte*, book iii. ch. viii. p. 812. ARNOLD's *Kirchen und Ketzer-Hiſtorie*, p. iii. ch. xvi. p. 115.

Private controverſies.

XXXVIII. It would be repugnant to the true end of hiſtory, as well as to all principles of candour and equity, to ſwell this enumeration of the controverſies that divided the Lutheran church, with the private diſputes of certain individuals concerning ſome particular points of doctrine and worſhip. Some writers have, indeed, followed this method, not ſo much with a deſign to enrich their hiſtories with a multitude of facts, and to ſhew men and opinions in all their various aſpects, as with a view to render the Lutherans ridiculous or odious. In the happieſt times, and in the beſt modelled communities, there will always remain ſufficient marks of human imperfection, and abundant ſources of private contention, at leaſt in the imprudence and miſtakes of ſome, and the impatience and ſeverity of others; but it muſt betray a great want of ſound judgment, as well as of candour and impartiality, to form a general eſtimate of the ſtate and character of a whole church upon ſuch particular inſtances of imperfection and error. Certain ſingular opinions and modes of expreſſion were cenſured by many in the writings of TARNOVIUS and AFFELMAN, two divines of *Roſtoch*, who were otherwiſe men of diſtinguiſhed merit. This, however, will ſurpriſe us leſs, when we conſider, that theſe doctors often expreſſed themſelves improperly, when their ſentiments were juſt; and that, when their expreſſions were accurate and proper, they were frequently miſunderſtood by thoſe who pretended to cenſure them. JOACHIM LUTKEMAN, a man whoſe reputation was conſiderable, and, in many reſpects, well deſerved, took it into his head to deny that CHRIST remained *true man* during the three days that intervened between his death and reſurrection. This ſentiment appeared highly erroneous to many; hence aroſe a conteſt, which was merely a

diſpute

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART II.

diſpute about words, reſembling many other debates, which, like bubbles, are inceſſantly ſwelling and vaniſhing on the ſurface of human life. Of this kind, more eſpecially, was the controverſy which, for ſome time, exerciſed the talents of BOETIUS and BALDUIN, profeſſors of divinity, the former at *Helmſtadt*, and the latter at *Wittemberg*, and had for its ſubject the following queſtion, *Whether or no the wicked ſhall one day be reſtored to life by the merits of Chriſt?* In the dutchy of *Holſtein*, REINBOTH diſtinguiſhed himſelf by the ſingularity of his opinions. After the example of CALIXTUS, he reduced the fundamental doctrines of religion within narrower bounds than are uſually preſcribed to them; he alſo conſidered the opinion of thoſe Greeks, who deny that the *Holy Ghoſt* proceeds from the *Son*, as an error of very little conſequence. In both theſe reſpects, his ſentiments were adopted by many; they, however, met with oppoſition from ſeveral quarters, and were cenſured, with peculiar warmth, by the learned JOHN CONRAD DANHAVER, profeſſor of divinity at *Straſburg*; in conſequence of this, a kind of controverſy was kindled between theſe two eminent men, and was carried on with more vehemence than the nature and importance of the matters in debate could well juſtify [*x*]. But theſe and other conteſts of this nature muſt not be admitted into that liſt of controverſies, from which we are to form a judgment of the internal ſtate of the Lutheran church during this century.

[*x*] For an account of all theſe controverſies in general, ſee ARNOLDI *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. et Hæret.* p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. vi. p. 957. That which was occaſioned by REINBOTH is amply and circumſtantially related by MOLLERUS, in his *Introductio ad Hiſtoriam Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ*, p. ii. p. 190. and in his *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 692.

The debates relating to Prætorius and Arndt.

XXXIX. We cannot ſay the ſame thing of certain controverſies, which were of a perſonal rather than a real nature, and related to the orthodoxy or unſoundneſs of certain men, rather than to the truth or falſehood of certain opinions; for theſe are ſomewhat more eſſentially connected with the internal ſtate and hiſtory of the church, than the conteſts laſt mentioned. It is not unuſual for thoſe, who profeſſedly embark in the cauſe of declining piety, and aim, in a ſolemn, zealous, and public manner, at its revival and reſtoration, to be elated with high and towering views, and warm with a certain enthuſiaſtic, though noble fervour. This elevation and ardour of mind is by no means a ſource of accuracy and preciſion; on the contrary, it produces many unguarded expreſſions, and prevents men of warm piety from forming their language by thoſe rules which are neceſſary to render it clear, accurate, and proper; it frequently dictates expreſſions and phraſes that are pompous and emphatic, but, at the ſame time, allegorical and ambiguous; and leads pious and even ſenſible men to adopt uncouth and vulgar forms of ſpeech, employed by writers whoſe ſtyle is as low and barbarous as their intentions are upright and pious, and whoſe practical treatiſes on religion and morality have nothing recommendable but the zeal and fervour with which they are penned. Perſons of this warm and enthuſiaſtical turn fall with more facility than any other ſet of men into the ſuſpicion of hereſy, on account of the inaccuracy of their expreſſions. This many doctors found to be true, by a diſagreeable experience, during the courſe of this century; but it was, in a more particular manner, the fate of STEPHEN PRÆTORIUS, miniſter of *Solzwedel*, and of JOHN ARNDT, whoſe piety and virtue have rendered his memory precious to the friends of true religion. PRÆTORIUS

TORIUS had, ſo early as the preceding century, compoſed certain treatiſes, deſigned to revive a ſpirit of vital religion, and awaken in the minds of men a zeal for their future and eternal intereſts. Theſe productions, which were frequently republiſhed during this century, were highly applauded by many, while, in the judgment of others, they abounded with expreſſions and ſentiments, that were partly falſe, and partly adapted by their ambiguity to lead men into error. It cannot be denied, that there are in the writings of PRÆTORIUS ſome improper and unguarded expreſſions, that may too eaſily deceive the ignorant and unwary, as alſo ſeveral marks of that credulity that borders upon weakneſs; but thoſe who peruſe his works with impartiality will be fully perſuaded of the uprightneſs of his intentions.

The unfeigned piety and integrity of ARNDT could not ſecure him from cenſure. His famous book concerning *true Chriſtianity*, which is ſtill peruſed with the utmoſt pleaſure and edification by many perſons eminent for the ſanctity of their lives and manners, met with a warm and obſtinate oppoſition. OSIANDER, ROSTIUS, and other doctors, inveighed againſt it with exceſſive bitterneſs, pretended to find in it various defects, and alleged, among other things, that its ſtyle was infected with the jargon of the *Paracelſiſts*, *Weigelians*, and other *Myſtico-chemical* philoſophers. It muſt, indeed, be acknowledged, that this eminent man entertained a high diſguſt againſt the philoſophy that, in his time, reigned in the ſchools; nor can it be denied, that he had a high, perhaps an exceſſive, degree of reſpect for the chemiſts, and an ill-placed confidence in their obſcure deciſions and pompous undertakings. This led him ſometimes into converſation with thoſe fantaſtic philoſophers, who, by the power and miniſtry of *fire*, pretended to unfold both the ſecrets of nature and the myſteries of religion. But, notwithſtanding this, he was declared exempt from any errors of moment by a multitude of grave and pious divines, among whom were EGARD, DILGER, BRELER, GERHARD, and DORSCHÆUS; and in the iſſue the cenſures and oppoſition of his adverſaries ſeemed rather to caſt a new luſtre on his reputation than to cover him with reproach [*y*]. We may place in the claſs, now under conſideration, VALENTINE WEIGELIUS, a miniſter of the church of *Zſcopavia* in *Miſnia*; for though he died in the preceding century, yet it was in this that the greateſt part of his writings were publiſhed, and alſo cenſured as erroneous and of a dangerous tendency. The ſcience of chemiſtry, which at this time was making ſuch a rapid progreſs in *Germany*, proved alſo detrimental to this eccleſiaſtic; who, though in the main a man of probity and merit, neglected the paths of right reaſon, and choſe rather to wander in the devious wilds of a chimerical philoſophy [*z*].

Jacob Bohmius or Boemen.

XL. There were a ſet of fanatics among the Lutherans, who in the flights of their enthuſiaſm far ſurpaſſed thoſe now mentioned, and who had ſuch a high notion of their own abilities as to attempt melting down the preſent form of religion, and caſting a new ſyſtem of piety after a model drawn from their wanton and irregular fancies; it is with ſome account of the principal of theſe ſpiritual projectors that we ſhall conclude the hiſtory of the Lutheran church during this century.

[*y*] See ARNOLDI *Hiſt. Eccleſ. et Hæretica*, p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. vi. p. 940.—WEISMANNI *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Sæc.* xvii. p. 1174. 1189.—GODOF. BALTH. SCHARFII *Supplementum Hiſtoriæ, Litiſque Arndtianæ. Wittem.* 1727, in 8vo.

[*z*] There is an account of WEIGELIUS, more ample than impartial, given by ARNOLD, *loc. cit.* lib. xvii. cap. xvii. p. 1088.

At the head of this viſionary tribe we may place JACOB BEHMEN, a taylor at *Gorlitz*, who was remarkable for the multitude of his patrons and adverſaries, and whom his admirers commonly called the *German Theoſophiſt*. This man had a natural propenſity towards the inveſtigation of myſteries, and was fond of abſtruſe and intricate inquiries of every kind; and having, partly by books and partly by converſation with certain phyſicians [a], acquired ſome knowledge of the doctrine of ROBERT FLUDD and the *Roſicruſians*, which was propagated in *Germany* with great oſtentation during this century, he ſtruck out of the element of *fire*, by the ſuccours of imagination, a ſpecies of theology much more obſcure than the numbers of PYTHAGORAS, or the intricacies of HERACLITUS. Some have beſtowed high praiſes on this enthuſiaſt, on account of his piety, integrity, and ſincere love of truth and virtue; and we ſhall not pretend to contradict theſe encomiums. But ſuch as carry their admiration of his doctrine ſo far as to honour him with the character of an *inſpired meſſenger of heaven*, or even of a judicious and wiſe philoſopher, muſt be themſelves deceived and blinded in a very high degree; for never did their reign ſuch obſcurity and confuſion in the writings of any mortal, as in the miſerable productions of JACOB BEHMEN, which exhibit a motley mixture of chemical terms, crude viſions, and myſtic jargon. Among other dreams of a diſturbed and eccentric fancy, he entertained the following chimerical notion: " That the " divine grace operates by the ſame rules, and " follows the ſame methods, that the divine pro" vidence obſerves in the natural world; and

---

[a] *Viz.* TOBIAS KOBER and BALTHAZAR WALTHER.

"that the minds of men are purged from "their vices and corruptions in the ſame way "that metals are purified from their droſs;" and this maxim was the principle of his fire-theology. BEHMEN had a conſiderable number of followers, in this century, the moſt eminent of whom were JOHN LEWIS, GIFTTHEIL, JOHN ANGELUS, WERDENHAGEN, ABRAHAM FRANCKENBERG, THEODORE TZETSCH, PAUL FELGENHAVER, QUIRINUS KUHLMAN, JOHN JACOB ZIMMERMAN; and he has ſtill many votaries and admirers even in our times. There was, indeed, a ſignal difference between his followers; ſome of them retained, notwithſtanding their attachment to his extravagant ſyſtem, a certain degree of moderation and good ſenſe; others of them ſeemed entirely out of their wits, and by their frenzy excited the compaſſion of thoſe who were the ſpectators of their conduct; ſuch were KUHLMAN and GICHTELIUS, the former of whom was burnt at *Moſcow* in the year 1684; but, indeed, it may be affirmed in general, that none of the diſciples or followers of BEHMEN propagated his doctrine, or conducted themſelves, in ſuch a manner as to do honour either to their maſter or to his cauſe in the judgment of the wiſe [*b*].

XLI. Another

[*b*] It is needleſs to mention the writers who employed their pens in ſtemming the torrent of BEHMEN's enthuſiaſm. The works of this fanatic are in every body's hands, and the books that were compoſed to refute them are well known, and to be found every where. All that has been alleged in his favour and defence has been carefully collected by ARNOLD, who is, generally ſpeaking, peculiarly eloquent in the praiſes of thoſe whom others treat with contempt. For an account of KUHLMAN, and his unhappy fate, ſee the German work, entitled, *Unſchuld. Nachricht.* A. 1748.

☞ BEHMEN, however, had the good fortune to meet with, in our days, a warm advocate and an induſtrious diſciple in the late well-meaning, but gloomy and viſionary, Mr. WIL-

LIAM

The prophets of this age.

XLI. Another claſs of perſons, who deſerve to be placed immediately after BEHMEN, were they, whom a diſordered brain perſuaded that they were prophets ſent from above, and that they were divinely inſpired with the power of foretelling future events. A conſiderable number of theſe delirious fanatics aroſe during the courſe of this century; and more eſpecially at that juncture when the houſe of *Auſtria* was employed in maintaining its power, in the empire, againſt the united armies of *Sweden*, *France*, and *Germany*. It is remarkable enough, that the tribe of pretended prophets and diviners is never more numerous than at thoſe critical and ſtriking periods when great revolutions are expected, or ſudden and heavy calamities have happened; as ſuch periods, and the ſcenes they exhibit, inflame the imagination of the fanatic, and may be turned to the profit of the impoſtor. The moſt eminent of the fanatical prophets now under conſideration, were NICHOLAS DRABICIUS, CHRISTOPHER KOTTER, CHRISTINA PONIATOVIA, who found an eloquent defender and patron in JOHN AMOS COMENIO; not to mention JOACHIM GREULICH, ANNE VETTER, MARY FROELICH, GEORGE REICHARD, and ſeveral others, who audaciouſly aſſumed the ſame character. It is not neceſſary to enter into a more circumſtantial detail of the hiſtory of this viſionary tribe, ſince none of them aroſe to ſuch a degree of reputation and conſequence, as to occaſion any conſiderable tumults by their predictions. It is ſufficient to have obſerved in general, that, even in this century, there were among the Lutherans certain crazy fanatics, who, under the

---

LIAM LAW, who was, for many years, preparing a new edition and tranſlation of BEHMEN's works, which he left behind him ready for the preſs, and which have been publiſhed in two vols. 4to, ſince his deceaſe. N.

impulſe of a diſordered imagination, aſſumed the character and authority of prophets ſent from above to enlighten the world [*c*].

Ezekiel Meth, Iſaiah Stiefel, Paul Nagel.

XLII. It will not, however, be improper to mention, ſomewhat more circumſtantially, the caſe of thoſe, who, though they did not arrive at that enormous height of folly that leads men to pretend to divine inſpiration, yet deceived themſelves and deluded others, by entertaining and propagating the ſtrangeſt fancies and the moſt monſtrous and impious abſurdities. Some time after the commencement of this century, ISAIAH STIEFEL and EZEKIEL METH, inhabitants of *Thuringia*, were obſerved to throw out the moſt extraordinary and ſhocking expreſſions while they ſpoke of themſelves and their religious attainments. Theſe expreſſions, in the judgment of many, amounted to nothing leſs than attributing to themſelves the divine glory and majeſty, and thus implied a blaſphemous, or rather a frenetic, inſult on the Supreme Being and his eternal Son. It is nevertheleſs ſcarcely credible, however irrational we may ſuppoſe them to have been, that theſe fanatics ſhould have carried their perverſe and abſurd fancies to ſuch an amazing height; and it would perhaps be more agreeable both to truth and charity to ſuppoſe, that they had imitated the pompous and turgid language of the myſtic writers in ſuch an extravagant manner, as to give occaſion to the heavy accuſation above mentioned. Conſidering the matter even in this candid and charitable light, we may ſee by their examples how much the conſtant peruſal of the writings of the Myſtics is adapted to ſhed darkneſs, deluſion, and folly into the imagination of weak and ignorant men [*d*]. The reveries of PAUL NAGEL, profeſſor of divinity at *Leipſic*, were highly abſurd, but of a much leſs pernicious tendency than theſe already mentioned. This prophetic dreamer, who had received a light tincture of mathematical knowledge, pretended to ſee, in the poſition of the ſtars, the events that were to happen in church and ſtate; and, from a view of theſe celeſtial bodies, foretold, in a more particular manner, the erection of a new and moſt holy kingdom in which CHRIST ſhould reign here upon earth [*e*].

[*c*] ARNOLD is to be commended for giving us an accurate collection of the tranſactions and viſions of theſe enthuſiaſts, in the third and fourth parts of his *Hiſtory of Heretics*; ſince thoſe who are deſirous of full information in this matter may eaſily ſee, by conſulting this hiſtorian, that the pretended revelations of theſe prophets were no more than the phantoms of a diſordered imagination. A certain pious but ignorant man, named BENEDICT BAHNSEN, who was a native of *Holſtein*, and lived at *Amſterdam* about the middle of the laſt century, was ſo delighted with the writings and predictions of theſe fanatics, that he collected them carefully and publiſhed them. In the year 1670, a catalogue of his library was printed at *Amſterdam*, which was full of chemical and fanatical books.

Chriſtian Hoburg, Frederic Breckling, Seidenbecher.

XLIII. CHRISTIAN HOBURG, a native of *Lunenburg*, a man of a turbulent and inconſtant ſpirit, and not more remarkable for this violence than for his duplicity, threw out the moſt bitter reproaches and invectives againſt the whole Lutheran church without exception [*f*], and thereby involved himſelf in various perplexities. He deceived indeed the multitude a long time, by his diſſimulation and hypocriſy; and by a ſeries of frauds, which he undoubtedly looked upon as lawful, he diſguiſed ſo well his true character that he appeared to many, and eſpecially to perſons of a candid and charitable turn, much leſs contemptible than he was in reality; and though the acrimony and violence of his proceedings were condemned, yet they were ſuppoſed to be directed, not againſt religion itſelf, but againſt the licentiouſneſs and vices of its profeſſors, and particularly of its miniſters. At length, however, the maſk fell from the face of this hypocrite, who became an object of general indignation and contempt, and, deſerting the communion of the Lutheran church, went over to the Mennonites [g]. There was a ſtriking reſemblance between this petulant railer and FREDERICK BRECKLING; the latter, however, ſurpaſſed even the former in impetuoſity and malignity. BRECKLING had been paſtor firſt in the duchy of *Holſtein*, and afterwards at *Zwoll*, a city in the United Provinces, where he was depoſed from his miniſtry, and lived a great many years after without being attached to any religious ſect or community. There are ſeveral of his writings ſtill extant, which, indeed, recommend warmly the practice of piety and virtue, and ſeem to expreſs the moſt implacable abhorrence of vicious perſons and licentious manners; and yet, at the ſame time, they demonſtrate plainly that their author was deſtitute of that charity, prudence, meekneſs, patience, and love of truth, which are the eſſential and fundamental virtues of a real Chriſtian [h]. It is undoubtedly a juſt matter of ſurpriſe, that theſe vehement declaimers againſt the eſtabliſhed religion and its miniſters, who pretend to be ſo much more ſagacious and ſharp-ſighted than their brethren, do not perceive a truth, which the moſt ſimple may learn from daily obſervation; even that nothing is more odious and diſguſting than an angry, petulant, and violent reformer, who comes to heal the diſorders of a community, armed, as it were, with fire and ſword, with menaces and terrors. It is alſo to be wondered, that theſe men are not aware of another conſideration equally obvious, namely, that it is ſcarcely credible, that a *ſpiritual* phyſician will cure another with entire ſucceſs of the diſorders under which he himſelf is known to labour.

[*d*] See ARNOLD, *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. et Hæret.* p. iii. cap. iv. p. 32.—THOMASIUS, in his German work entitled, *Hiſtorie de Weiſheit und Narrheit*, vol. i. p. iii. p. 150.

[*e*] ARNOLD, *loc. cit.* p. iii. cap. v. p. 53.—ANDR. CAROLI *Memorabilia Eccleſiæ, Sæc.* xvii. pars i. lib. iii. cap. iv. p. 513.

[*f*] HOBURG, in ſome of his petulant and ſatirical writings, aſſumed the names of ELIAS PRÆTORIUS and BERNARD BAUMANN.

---

[g] ARNOLD, *loc. cit.* p. iii. cap. xiii. p. 130.—ANDR. CAROLI, *loc. cit.* vol. i. p. 1065.—JO. HORNBECK, *Summa Controverſ.* p. 535.—MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 337.

[h] ARNOLD has given an account of BRECKLING, in his *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtica et Hæret.* pars iii. p. 148. and pars iv. p. 1103. he has alſo publiſhed ſome of his writings (p. 1110.) which ſufficiently demonſtrate the irregularity and exuberance of his fancy. There is a particular account of this degraded paſtor given by MOLLERUS, in his *Cimbria Literata*, tom. iii. p. 72.

GEORGE LAURENCE SEIDENBECHER, paſtor at *Eisfield* in *Saxony*, adopted himſelf, and propagated among the multitude, the doctrine of the MILLENNIUM or thouſand years reign of CHRIST upon earth; a doctrine which ſcarcely ever gains admittance but in diſordered brains, and rarely produces any other fruits than incoherent dreams and idle viſions. SEIDENBECHER was cenſured on account of this doctrine, and depoſed from his paſtoral charge [*i*].

Martin Seidel.

XLIV. It would be ſuperfluous to name the other fanatics that deſerve a place in the claſs now before us, ſince they almoſt all laboured under the ſame diſorder, and the uniformity of their ſentiments and conduct was ſo perfect, that the hiſtory of one, a few inſtances excepted, may, in a great meaſure, be conſidered as the hiſtory of them all. We ſhall therefore conclude this crazy liſt with a ſhort account of the very worſt of the whole tribe, MARTIN SEIDELIUS, a native of *Sileſia*, who endeavoured to form a ſect in *Poland* towards the concluſion of the preceding century and the commencement of this, but could not find followers, even among the Socinians; ſo wild were his views, and ſo extravagant his notions. This audacious adventurer in religious novelties was of opinion, that God had, indeed, promiſed a Saviour or MESSIAH to the Jews; but that *this* MESSIAH had never appeared, and never would appear, on account of the ſins of the Jewiſh people, which rendered them unworthy of this great deliverer. From hence he concluded, that it was erroneous to look upon CHRIST as the MESSIAH; that the only office of JESUS was, to interpret and republiſh the law of nature, that had been perverted and obſcured by the vices, corruptions, and ignorance of men; and that the whole duty of men, and all the obligations of religion; were fulfilled by an obedience to this law, republiſhed and explained by JESUS CHRIST. To render this doctrine more defencible and ſpecious, or, at leaſt, to get rid of a multitude of arguments and expreſs declarations that might be drawn from the holy Scriptures to prove its abſurdity, he boldly rejected all the books of the New Teſtament. The ſmall number of diſciples, that adopted the fancies of this intrepid innovator, were denominated *ſemi-judaizers* [k]. Had he appeared in our times, he would have given leſs offence than at the period in which he lived; for, if we except his ſingular notion concerning the MESSIAH, his doctrine was ſuch as would at preſent be highly agreeable to many perſons in *Great Britain*, *Holland*, and other countries [l].

[*i*] There is a circumſtantial account of this man given by ALB. MENO VERPOORTEN, in his *Commentat. de vita et inſtitutis* G. L. SEIDENBECHERI, *Gedani*, 1739, 4to.

---

[k] See GUSTAVI GEORGII ZELTNERI *Hiſtoria Crypto Socinifmi Altorffini*, vol. i. p. 268. 335.

☞ [l] We are much at a loſs to know what Dr. MOSHEIM means by this inſinuation, as alſo the perſons he has in view; for,

CHAPTER II.

The HISTORY *of the* REFORMED CHURCH.

The limits of the Reformed church extended.

I. IT has been already obſerved, that the Reformed church, conſidered in the moſt comprehenſive ſenſe of that term, as forming a *whole*, compoſed of a great variety of parts, is rather united by the principles of moderation and fraternal charity, than by a perfect uniformity in doctrine, diſcipline, and worſhip. It will, therefore, be proper to take, firſt a view of thoſe events that related to this great body collectively conſidered; and afterwards to enter into a detail of the moſt memorable occurrences that happened in the particular communities of which it is compoſed. The principal acceſſions it received during this century have already been mentioned, when, in the hiſtory of the Lutheran church, we related the changes and commotions that happened in the principalities of *Heſſia* and *Brandenburg* [m]. Theſe, however, were not the only changes that took place in favour of the Reformed church.

---

for, on the one hand, it is ſufficiently evident, that he cannot mean the *Deiſts*; and, on the other, we know of no denomination of Chriſtians, who *boldly reject all the books of the New Teſtament*. Our author probably meant, that the part of SEIDEL's doctrine which repreſents Chriſt's Miſſion as *only* deſigned to *republiſh* and interpret the *Law of Nature*, and the *whole* religious and moral duty of man as conſiſting in an obedience to this Law, would have been well received by many perſons in *Great Britain* and *Holland*; but he ſhould have ſaid ſo; nothing requires ſuch preciſion as accuſations.

[m] See ſection ii. part ii. chap. i. § i, ii. where the *Hiſtory of the Lutheran Church* commences with an account of the loſs that church ſuſtained by the ſeceſſion of MAURICE, landgrave of *Heſſe-Caſſel*, and JOHN SIGISMUND, elector of *Brandenburg*, who embraced ſolemnly the doctrine of the Reformed church, the former in 1604, and the latter in 1614.

church. Its doctrine was embraced, about the commencement of this century, by ADOLPHUS, duke of *Holſtein*, and it was naturally expected, that the ſubjects would follow the example of their prince; but this expectation was diſappointed, by the death of ADOLPHUS, in the year 1616 [*n*]. HENRY, duke of *Saxony*, withdrew alſo from the communion of the Lutherans, in whoſe religious principles he had been educated; and, in the year 1688, embraced the doctrine of the Reformed church at *Deſſaw*, in conſequence, as ſome allege, of the ſolicitations of his ducheſs [*o*]. In *Denmark*, about the beginning of this century, there were ſtill a conſiderable number of perſons who ſecretly eſpouſed the ſentiments of that church, and more eſpecially could never reconcile themſelves to the Lutheran doctrine of CHRIST's *bodily preſence with the ſacrament of the euchariſt*. They were confirmed in their attachment to the tenets of the Reformed by HEMMINGIUS, and other followers of MELANCTHON, whoſe ſecret miniſtry and public writings were attended with conſiderable ſucceſs. The face of things, however, changed; and the Reformed in *Denmark* ſaw their expectations vaniſh, and their credit ſink, in the year 1614, when CANUT Biſhop of *Gottenburg*, who had given too plain intimations of his propenſity to the doctrines of CALVIN, was deprived of his epiſcopal dignity [p]. The progreſs of the Reformed religion in *Africa*, *Aſia*, and *America*, is abundantly known; it was carried into theſe diſtant regions by the Engliſh and Dutch emigrants, who formed ſettlements there for the purpoſes of commerce, and founded flouriſhing churches in the various provinces where they fixed their habitations. It is alſo known, that in ſeveral places where Lutheraniſm was eſtabliſhed, the French, German, and Britiſh members of the Reformed church were allowed the free exerciſe of their religion.

[*n*] JO. MOLLERI *Introd. ad Hiſtor. Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ*, p. ii. p. 101.—ERIC. PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Eccleſiæ Danicæ Diplomatici*, tom. iii. p. 691.

[*o*] See MOEBII *Selectæ Diſp. Theolog.* p. 1137.—The duke of *Saxony* publiſhed to the world a *Confeſſion of his Faith*, containing the reaſons of his change. This piece, which the divines of *Leipſick* were obliged by a public order to refute, was defended againſt their attacks by the learned ISAAC DE BEAUSOBRE, at that time paſtor at *Magdeburg*, in a book, entitled, *Defenſe de la Doctrine des Reformées, et en particulier de la Confeſſion de S. A. S. Miſgr. le Duc* HENRY DE SAXE *contre un Livre composé par la Faculté de Theologie à Leipſic. Magdeb.* 1694, in 8vo.

The decline of the Reformed church in *France*.

II. Of all the calamities that tended to diminiſh the influence, and eclipſe the luſtre, of the Reformed church, none was more diſmal in its circumſtances, and more unhappy in its effects, than the deplorable fate of that church in *France*. From the time of the acceſſion of HENRY IV. to the throne of that kingdom, the Reformed church had acquired the form of a body-politic [q]. Its members were endowed with conſiderable privileges; they were alſo ſecured againſt inſults of every kind by a ſolemn edict, and were poſſeſſed of ſeveral fortified places, particularly the ſtrong city of *Rochelle*; in which, to render their ſecurity ſtill more complete, they were allowed to have their own garriſons. This body-politic was not, indeed, always under the influence and direction of leaders eminent for their prudence, or diſtinguiſhed by their permanent attachment to the intereſts of the crown, and the perſon of the ſovereign. Truth and candour oblige us to acknowledge, that the *Reformed* conducted themſelves, on ſome occaſions, in a manner inconſiſtent with the demands of a regular ſubordination. Sometimes, amidſt the broils and tumults of faction, they joined the parties that oppoſed the government; at others, they took important ſteps without the king's approbation or conſent; nay, they went ſo far as to ſolicit, more than once, without ſo much as diſguiſing their meaſures, the alliance and friendſhip of *England* and *Holland*, and formed views which, at leaſt in appearance, were ſcarcely conſiſtent with the tranquillity of the kingdom, nor with a proper reſpect for the authority of its monarch. Hence the conteſts and civil broils that aroſe in the year 1621, and ſubſiſted long, between LEWIS XIII. and his proteſtant ſubjects; and hence the ſevere and deſpotic maxim of RICHLIEU, the firſt miniſter of that monarch, that the kingdom of *France* could never enjoy the ſweets of peace, nor the ſatisfaction that is founded upon the aſſurance of public ſafety, before the Proteſtants were deprived of their towns and ſtrong-holds, and before their rights and privileges, together with their eccleſiaſtical polity, were cruſhed to pieces, and totally ſuppreſſed. This haughty miniſter, after many violent efforts and hard ſtruggles, obtained, at length, his purpoſe; for, in the year 1628, the town of *Rochelle*, the chief bulwark of the Reformed intereſt in *France*, was taken, after a long and difficult ſiege, and annexed to the crown. From this fatal event, the Reformed party in *France*, defenceleſs and naked, dates its decline; ſince, after the reduction of their chief city, they had no other reſource than the pure clemency and generoſity of their ſovereign [r]. Thoſe who judge of the reduction of this place by the maxims of civil policy, conſidered the conduct of the French court as entirely conſiſtent with the principles both of wiſdom and juſtice: ſince nothing can be more detrimental to the tranquillity and ſafety of the nation, than a body-politic erected in its boſom, independent on the ſupreme authority of the ſtate, and ſecured againſt its influence or inſpection by an external force. And had the French monarch, ſatisfied with depriving the Proteſtants of their ſtrong-holds, continued to maintain them in the poſſeſſion of that liberty of conſcience, and that free exerciſe of their religion, for which they had ſhed ſo much blood, and to the enjoyment of which their eminent ſervices to the houſe of *Bourbon* had given them ſuch a fair and illuſtrious title, it is highly probable, they would have borne with patience this infraction of their privileges, and the loſs of that liberty that had been confirmed to them by the moſt ſolemn edicts.

---

[p] PONTOPPIDAN. *Annal. Eccleſ. Danicæ*, tom. iii. p. 695.

[q] *Imperium in imperio*, i. e. an empire within an empire.

---

[r] See LE CLERC *Vie de Cardinal* RICHLIEU, tom. i. p. 69. 77. 177. 199. 269.—LE VASSOR, *Hiſtoire de* LOUIS XIII. tom. iii. p. 676. tom. iv. p. 1. and the following volumes. See alſo the *Memoirs* of SULLY (the friend and confident of HENRY IV., who, though a Proteſtant, acknowledges frankly the errors of his party), vol. iii, iv, v.

The injurious and tyrannical treatment it receives from the French court.

III. But the court of *France*, and the deſpotic views of its miniſter, were not ſatisfied with this ſucceſs. Having deſtroyed that form of civil polity that had been annexed to the Reformed church as a ſecurity for the maintenance of its religious privileges, and was afterwards conſidered as detrimental to the ſupreme authority of the ſtate, they proceeded ſtill further, and, regardleſs of the royal faith, confirmed by the moſt ſolemn declarations, perfidiouſly invaded thoſe privileges of the church that were merely of a ſpiritual and religious nature. At firſt, the court, and the miniſters of its tyranny, put in practice all the arts of inſinuation and perſuaſion, in order to gain over the heads of the Reformed church, and the more learned and celebrated miniſters of that communion. Pathetic exhortations, alluring promiſes, artful interpretations of thoſe doctrines of popery that were moſt diſagreeable to the Proteſtants; in a word, every inſidious method was employed, to conquer their averſion to the church of *Rome*. Richlieu exhauſted all the reſources of his dexterity and artifice, and put into execution, with the moſt induſtrious aſſiduity, all the means that he thought the moſt adapted to ſeduce the Proteſtants into the Romiſh communion. When all theſe ſtratagems were obſerved to produce little or no effect, barbarity and violence were employed to extirpate and deſtroy a ſet of men, whom mean perfidy could not ſeduce, and whom weak arguments were inſufficient to convince. The moſt inhuman laws that the blind rage of bigotry could dictate, the moſt oppreſſive meaſures that the ingenious efforts of malice could invent, were put in execution, to damp the courage of a party, that were become odious by their reſolute adherence to the dictates of their conſciences, and to bring them by force under the yoke of *Rome*. The French biſhops diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their intemperate and unchriſtian zeal in this horrid ſcene of perſecution and cruelty; many of the Proteſtants ſunk under the weight of deſpotic oppreſſion, and yielded up their faith to armed legions, that were ſent to convert them; ſeveral fled from the ſtorm, and deſerted their families, their friends, and their country; and by far the greateſt part perſevered, with a noble and heroic conſtancy, in the purity of that religion, which their anceſtors had delivered, and happily ſeparated, from the manifold ſuperſtitions of a corrupt and idolatrous church.

The edict of *Nantes* revoked.

IV. When at length every method which artifice or perfidy could invent had been practiſed in vain againſt the Proteſtants under the reign of Lewis XIV., the biſhops and Jeſuits, whoſe counſels had a peculiar influence in the cabinet of that prince, judged it neceſſary to extirpate, by fire and ſword, this reſolute people; and thus to ruin, as it were by one mortal blow, the cauſe of the Reformation in *France*. Their inſidious arguments and importunate ſolicitations had ſuch an effect upon the weak and credulous mind of Lewis, that, in the year 1685, trampling on the moſt ſolemn obligations, and regardleſs of all laws, human and divine, he revoked the *Edict of Nantes*; and thereby deprived the Proteſtants of the liberty of ſerving God according to their conſciences. This revocation was accompanied, indeed, with the applauſe of *Rome*; but it excited the indignation even of many Roman Catholics, whoſe bigotry had not effaced or ſuſpended, on this occaſion, their natural ſentiments of generoſity and juſtice. It was, moreover, followed by a meaſure ſtill more tyrannical and ſhocking; even an expreſs order, addreſſed to all the Reformed churches, to embrace the Romiſh faith. The conſequences of this cruel and unrighteous proceeding were highly detrimental to the true intereſts and the real proſperity of the French nation [s], by the prodigious emigrations it occaſioned among the Proteſtants, who ſought, in various parts of *Europe*, that religious liberty, and that humane treatment, which their mother-country had ſo cruelly refuſed them. Thoſe among them, whom the vigilance of their enemies guarded ſo cloſely as to prevent their flight, were expoſed to the brutal rage of an unrelenting ſoldiery,

---

[s] See the *Life of* Isaac de Beausobre (compoſed by the ingenious Armand de la Chapelle in French, and ſubjoined to Beausobre's *Remarques Hiſtoriques, Critiques, et Philologiques ſur le Nouveau Teſtament*), p. 259.

☞ Some late hireling writers, employed by the Jeſuits, have been audacious enough to plead the cauſe of the *Revocation* of the edict of *Nantes*. But it muſt be obſerved, to the honour of the French nation, that theſe impotent attempts, to juſtify the meaſures of a perſecuting and unrelenting prieſthood, have been treated almoſt univerſally at *Paris* with indignation and contempt.

diery, and were aſſailed by every barbarous form of perſecution that could be adapted to ſubdue their courage, exhauſt their patience, and thus engage them to a feigned and external profeſſion of popery, which in their conſciences they beheld with the utmoſt averſion and diſguſt. This crying act of perfidy and injuſtice in a prince, who, on other occaſions, gave evident proofs of his generoſity and equity, is ſufficient to ſhew, in their true and genuine colours, the ſpirit of the Romiſh church and of the Roman pontifs, and the manner in which they ſtand affected to thoſe whom they conſider as *Heretics*. It is peculiarly adapted to convince the impartial and attentive obſerver, that the moſt ſolemn oaths, and the moſt ſacred treaties, are never looked upon by this church and its pontifs as reſpectable and obligatory, when the violation of them may contribute to advance their intereſts, or to accompliſh their views.

The ſufferings of the Waldenſes and Proteſtants of the *Palatinate*.

V. The *Waldenſes*, who lived in the vallies of *Piedmont*, and had embraced the doctrine, diſcipline, and worſhip of the church of *Geneva*, were oppreſſed and perſecuted, in the moſt barbarous and inhuman manner, during the greateſt part of this century, by the miniſters of *Rome*. This perſecution was carried on with peculiar marks

---

contempt. They who are deſirous of ſeeing a true ſtate of the loſſes the French nation ſuſtained, by the revocation of the famous edict now mentioned, have only to conſult the curious and authentic account of the ſtate of that nation, taken from memorials drawn up by intendants of the ſeveral provinces, for the uſe of the Duke of *Burgundy*, and publiſhed in the year 1727, in two volumes in *folio*, under the following title: *Etát de la France, extrait par M. le Comte de* BOULAINVILLIERS *des Memoires dreſsée par les Intendans du Royaume, par l'Ordre du Roi* LOUIS XIV., *à la Solicitation du Duc de Bourgogne*. See alſo VOLTAIRE, *Sur la Tolerance*, p. 41. and 201. And, for an account of the conduct of the French court towards the Proteſtants at that diſmal period, ſee the incomparable memorial of the learned and pious CLAUDE, entitled, *Plaintes des Proteſtans de France*, p. 12—85. edit. of *Cologn.*

of rage and enormity in the years 1655, 1686, and 1696, and ſeemed to portend nothing leſs than the total deſtruction and entire extinction of that unhappy nation [t]. The moſt horrid ſcenes of violence and bloodſhed were exhibited on this theatre of papal tyranny; and the ſmall numbers of the Waldenſes that ſurvived them, are indebted for their exiſtence and ſupport, precarious and uncertain as it is, to the continual interceſſion made for them by the Engliſh and Dutch governments, and alſo by the Swiſs cantons, who never ceaſe to ſolicit the clemency of the Duke of *Savoy* in their behalf.

The church of the *Palatinate*, which had been long at the head of the Reformed churches in *Germany*, declined apace from the year 1685, when a Roman Catholic prince was raiſed to that electorate. This decline became at length ſo great, that, inſtead of being the firſt, it was the leaſt conſiderable of all the Proteſtant aſſemblies in that country.

The ſtate of letters and philoſophy in the Reformed church.

VI. The eminent and illuſtrious figure that the principal members of the Reformed church made in the learned world is too well known, and the reputation they acquired, by a ſucceſsful application to the various branches of literature and ſcience, is too well eſtabliſhed, to require our entering into a circumſtantial detail of that matter. We ſhall alſo paſs in ſilence the names of thoſe celebrated men who have acquired immortal fame by their writings, and tranſmitted their eminent uſefulneſs to ſucceeding times in their learned and pious productions. Out of the large liſt of theſe famous authors that adorned the Reformed church, it would be difficult to ſelect the moſt eminent; and this is a ſufficient reaſon for our ſilence [*u*]. The ſupreme guide and legiſlator of thoſe that applied themſelves to the ſtudy of philoſophy had been ARISTOTLE, who, for a long time, reigned unrivalled in the Reformed, as well as in the Lutheran ſchools; and was exhibited, in both, not in his natural and genuine aſpect, but in the motley and uncouth form in which he had been dreſſed up by the ſcholaſtic doctors. But when GASSENDI and DES CARTES appeared, the Stagirite began to decline, and his fame and authority diminiſhed gradually from day to day. Among the French and Dutch, many adopted the Carteſian philoſophy at its firſt dawn; and a conſiderable number

---

[t] LEGER, *Hiſtoire Generale des Egliſes Vaudoiſes*, p. ii., c. vi. p. 72.—GILLES, *Hiſtoire Eccleſiaſt. des Egliſes Vaudoiſes*, ch. xlix. p. 353.—There is a particular hiſtory of the perſecution ſuffered by theſe victims of papal cruelty in the year 1686, which was publiſhed in 8vo at *Rotterdam*, in the year 1688.

☞ See alſo a pamphlet, entitled, *An Account of the late Perſecutions of the Waldenſes by the* Duke of SAVOY and the French King in the year 1686, publiſhed at *Oxford* in 4to in 1688. See likewiſe a particular detail of the miſeries endured by theſe unfortunate objects of papal perſecution in the years 1655, 1662, 1663, and 1686, related by PETER BOYER, in his hiſtory of the Vaudois, ch. 12—21. p. 72, &c.

☞ [*u*] The liſt of the eminent divines and men of learning that were ornaments to the Reformed church in the ſeventeenth century, is indeed extremely ample. Among thoſe that adorned *Great Britain,* we ſhall always remember, with peculiar veneration, the immortal names of *Newton, Barrow, Cudworth, Boyle, Chillingworth, Uſher, Bedell, Hall, Pocock, Fell, Lightfoot, Hammond, Calamy, Walton, Baxter; Pearſon, Stillingfleet, Mede, Parker, Oughtred, Burnet, Tillotſon,* and many others well known in the literary world. In *Germany* we find *Pareus, Scultet, Fabricius Alting, Pelargus,* and *Bergius.* In *Switzerland* and *Geneva, Hoſpinian,* the two *Buxtorfs, Hottinger, Heidegger,* and *Turretin.* In the churches and academies of *Holland,* we meet with the following learned divines: *Druſus, Amama, Gomer, Rivet, Cloppenburg, Voſſius, Cocceius, Voetius, Des Marets, Heidan, Momma, Burman, Wittichius, Hoornbeck,* the *Spanheims, Le Moyne, De Maſtricht,* and others. Among the French doctors, we may reckon *Cameron, Chamier, Du Moulin, Meſtrezat, Blondel, Drelincourt, Daillé, Amyraut,* the two *Cappels, Du la Place, Gamſtole, Croy, Morus, Le Blanc, Pajon, Bochart, Claude, Alix, Jurieu, Baſnage, Abbadie, Beauſobre, Lenfant, Martin, Des Vignoles, &c.*

of the Engliſh embraced the principles of Gassendi, and were ſingularly pleaſed with his prudent and candid manner of inveſtigating truth. The Ariſtotelians every where, and more eſpecially in *Holland*, were greatly alarmed at this revolution in the philoſophical world, and ſet themſelves, with all their vigour, to oppoſe its progreſs. They endeavoured to perſuade the people, that the cauſe of truth and religion muſt ſuffer conſiderably by the efforts that were made to dethrone Aristotle, and bring into diſrepute the doctrine of his interpreters; but the principal cauſe of their anxiety and zeal, was the apprehenſion of loſing their places in the public ſchools; a thought which they could not bear with any degree of patience [w]. However, the powerful luſtre of truth, which unfolded daily more and more its engaging charms, and the love of liberty, which had been held in chains by Peripatetic tyranny, obliged this obſtinate ſect to yield, and reduced them to ſilence; and hence it is, that the doctors of the Reformed church carry on, at this day, their philoſophical inquiries with the ſame freedom that is obſervable among the Lutherans. It may, indeed, be a queſtion with ſome, whether Aristotle be not, even yet, ſecretly revered in ſome of the Engliſh Univerſities. It is at leaſt certain, that, although under the government of Charles II., and the two ſucceeding reigns, the mathematical philoſophy had made a moſt extenſive progreſs in *Great Britain*, there were, nevertheleſs, both at *Oxford* and *Cambridge*, ſome doctors, who preferred the ancient ſyſtem of the ſchools before the new diſcoveries now under conſideration.

Interpreters and expoſitors of Scripture.

VII. All the interpreters and expoſitors of Scripture that made a figure in the Reformed church about the commencement of this century, followed ſcrupulouſly the method of CALVIN in their illuſtrations of the ſacred writings, and unfolded the true and natural ſignification of the words of Scripture, without perplexing their brains to find out deep myſteries in plain expreſſions, or to force, by the inventive efforts of fancy, a variety of ſingular notions from the metaphorical language that is frequently uſed by the inſpired writers. This univerſal attachment to the method of CALVIN was, indeed, conſiderably diminiſhed, in proceſs of time, by the credit and influence of two celebrated commentators, who ſtruck out new paths in the ſphere of ſacred criticiſm. Theſe were HUGO GROTIUS and JOHN COCCEIUS. The former departed leſs from the manner of interpretation generally received than the latter. Like CALVIN, he followed, in his commentaries both in the Old and New Teſtament, the literal and obvious ſignification of the words employed by the ſacred writers; but he differed conſiderably from that great man in his manner of explaining the predictions of the prophets. The hypotheſis of GROTIUS, relating to that important ſubject, amounts to this: "That "the predictions of the ancient prophets were all "accompliſhed, in the events to which they di"rectly pointed, before the coming of CHRIST; "and that therefore the natural and obvious "ſenſe of the words and phraſes, in which they "were delivered, does not terminate in our bleſſed "Lord; but that in certain of theſe predictions, "and more eſpecially in thoſe which the writers "of the New Teſtament apply to CHRIST, there "is, beſides the literal and obvious ſignification, "a hidden and myſterious ſenſe, that lies con"cealed under the external maſk of certain *per*"*ſons*, certain *events*, and certain *actions*, which

---

[w] See Baillet, *Vie de* Des Cartes, paſſim.

" are *repreſentatives* of the perſon, miniſtry, ſufferings, and merits of the Son of God."

The method of Cocceius was entirely different from this. He looked upon the whole hiſtory of the old Teſtament as a perpetual and uninterrupted repreſentation or mirrour of the hiſtory of the divine Saviour, and of the Chriſtian Church; he maintained, moreover, that all the prophecies have a literal and direct relation to Christ; and he finiſhed his romantic ſyſtem, by laying it down as a certain maxim, that all the events and revolutions that ſhall happen in the church, until the end of time, are prefigured and pointed out, though not all with the ſame degree of evidence and perſpicuity, in different places of the Old Teſtament [x]. Theſe two eminent commentators had each his zealous diſciples and followers. The Arminians in general, many of the Engliſh and French divines, together with thoſe warm votaries of ancient Calviniſm who are called *Voetſians* (from their chief Gisbert Voet, the great adverſary of Cocceius), all adopted the method of interpreting Scripture introduced by Grotius. On the other hand, many of the Dutch, Swiſs, and Germans, were ſingularly delighted with the learned fancies of Cocceius. There are, however, ſtill great numbers of prudent and impartial divines, who, conſidering the extremes into which theſe two eminent critics have run, and diſpoſed to profit by what is really ſolid in both their ſyſtems, neither reject nor embrace their opinions in the lump, but agree with them both in ſome things, and differ from them both in others. It is further to be obſerved, that neither the followers of GROTIUS nor of COCCEIUS are agreed among themſelves, and that theſe two general claſſes of expoſitors may be divided into many ſubordinate ones. A conſiderable number of Engliſh divines of the *Epiſcopal* church refuſed to adopt the opinions, or to reſpect the authority, of theſe modern expoſitors; they appealed to the deciſions of the primitive fathers; and maintained, that the ſacred writings ought always to be underſtood in that ſenſe *only*, which has been attributed to them by theſe ancient doctors of the riſing church [y].

---

[x] It is become almoſt a proverbial ſaying, that *in the Books of the Old Teſtament* Cocceius *finds* Christ *every where, while* Grotius *meets him no where.* The firſt part of this ſaying is certainly true; the latter much leſs ſo: for it appears, with ſufficient evidence, from the *Commentaries* of Grotius, that he finds Christ prefigured in many places of the Old Teſtament, not, indeed, *directly* in the *letter* of the prophecies, where Cocceius diſcovers him, but *myſteriouſly*, under the appearance of certain perſons, and in the *ſecret* ſenſe of certain tranſactions.

☞ [y] Theſe have been confuted by the learned Dr. WHITBY, in his important work, *Concerning the Interpretation of Scripture after the Manner of the Fathers*, which was publiſhed at *London* in 8vo, in the year 1714, under the following title: *Diſſertatio de Scripturarum Interpretatione ſecundum Patrum Commentarios*, &c.—In this diſſertation, which was the fore-runner of the many remarkable attempts that were afterwards made to deliver the right of private judgment, in matters of religion, from the reſtraints of human authority, the judicious author has ſhewn, *firſt*, that the Holy Scripture is the only rule of faith, and that by it alone we are to judge of the doctrines that are neceſſary to ſalvation; *ſecondly*, that the fathers, both of the primitive times and alſo of ſucceeding ages, are extremely deficient and unſucceſsful in their explications of the ſacred writings; and, *thirdly*, that it is impoſſible to terminate the debates that have been raiſed concerning the Holy Trinity, by the opinions of the fathers, the deciſions of councils, or by any tradition that is really univerſal. The contradictions, abſurdities, the romantic conceits and extravagant fancies, that are to be found in the commentaries of the fathers, were never repreſented in ſuch a ridiculous point of view as they are in this performance. The worſt part of the matter is, that ſuch a production as Dr. WHITBY's, in which all the miſtakes of theſe ancient expoſitors are culled out and compiled with ſuch care, is too much adopted to prejudice young ſtudents even againſt what may be good in their writings, and thus diſguſt them againſt a kind of ſtudy, which, when conducted with impartiality and prudence, has its uſes. It is the infirmity of our nature to be fond of extremes.

State of Didactic theology in the Reformed church.

VIII. The doctrines of Chriſtianity, which had been ſo ſadly disfigured among the Lutherans by the obſcure jargon and the intricate tenets of the ſcholaſtic philoſophy, met with the ſame fate in the Reformed churches. The firſt ſucceſsful effort, that prevented theſe churches from falling entirely under the *Ariſtotelian* yoke, was made by the *Arminians*, who were remarkable for expounding, with ſimplicity and perſpicuity, the truths and precepts of religion, and who cenſured, with great plainneſs and ſeverity, thoſe oſtentatious doctors, who affected to render them obſcure and unintelligible, by expreſſing them in the *terms*, and reducing them under the *claſſes* and diviſions, uſed in the ſchools. The *Carteſians* and *Cocceians* contributed alſo to deliver theology from the chains of the Peripatetics; though it muſt be allowed, that it had not, in ſome reſpects, a much better fate in the hands of theſe its deliverers. The *Carteſians* applied the principles and tenets of their philoſophy in illuſtrating the doctrines of the Goſpel; the *Cocceians* imagined, that they could not give a more ſublime and engaging aſpect to the Chriſtian religion, than by repreſenting it under the notion of a *covenant* entered into between God and man [z]; and both theſe manners of proceeding

---

☞ [z] It is ſomewhat ſurpriſing, that Dr. MOSHEIM ſhould mention this circumſtance as an invention of COCCEIUS, or as a manner of ſpeaking peculiar to him. The repreſentation of the Goſpel-diſpenſation under the idea of a *Covenant*, whether this repreſentation be literal or metaphorical, is to be found, almoſt every where, in the *Epiſtles of St.* PAUL, and the other Apoſtles, though very rarely (ſcarcely more than twice) in the Goſpels. This phraſeology has alſo been adopted by Chriſtians of almoſt all denominations. It is, indeed, a manner of ſpeaking that has been groſsly abuſed by thoſe divines, who, urging the metaphor too cloſely, exhibit the ſublime tranſactions of the divine wiſdom under the narrow and imperfect forms of human tribunals; and thus lead to falſe notions of the proceeding were diſliked by the wiſeſt and moſt learned divines of the Reformed church. They complained with reaſon, that the tenets and diſtinctions of the Carteſian philoſophy had as evident a tendency to render the doctrines of Chriſtianity obſcure and intricate as the abſtruſe terms, and the endleſs diviſions and ſubdiviſions of the Peripatetics. They obſerved alſo, that the metaphor of a *covenant*, applied to the Chriſtian religion, muſt be attended with many inconveniencies, by leading uninſtructed minds to form a variety of ill-grounded notions, which is the ordinary conſequence of ſtraining metaphors; and that it muſt contribute to introduce into the colleges of divinity the captious terms, diſtinctions, and quibbles, that are employed in the ordinary courts of juſtice; and thus give riſe to the moſt trifling and ill-judged diſcuſſions and debates about religious matters. Accordingly, the greateſt part both of the Britiſh and French doctors, refuſing to admit the intricacies of *Carteſianiſm*, and the imagery of COCCEIUS, into their theological ſyſtem, followed the free, eaſy, and unaffected method of the Arminian divines, in illuſtrating the truths, and enforcing the duties of Chriſtianity.

The ſtate of practical religion and morality.

IX. We have had formerly occaſion to obſerve, that Dr. WILLIAM AMES, a Scots divine, was one of the firſt among the Reformed who attempted to treat morality as a ſeparate ſcience, to conſider

---

the ſprings of action, as well as of the diſpenſations and attributes of the Supreme Being. We have remarkable inſtances of this abuſe, in a book lately tranſlated into Engliſh, I mean, the *Oeconomy of the Covenants*, by WITSIUS, in which that learned and pious man, who has deſervedly gained an eminent reputation by other valuable productions, has inconſiderately introduced the captious, formal, and trivial terms, employed in human courts, into his deſcriptions of the ſtupendous ſcheme of redemption.

it abſtractedly from its connexion with any particular ſyſtem of doctrine, and to introduce new light, and a new degree of accuracy and preciſion, into this *maſter-ſcience* of life and manners. The attempt was laudable, had it been well executed; but the ſyſtem of this learned writer was dry, theoretical, and ſubtile, and was thus much more adapted to the inſtruction of the ſtudious than to the practical direction of the Chriſtian. The Arminians, who are known to be much more zealous in enforcing the duties of Chriſtianity than in illuſtrating its truths, and who generally employ more pains in directing the will than in enlightening the underſtanding, engaged ſeveral authors of note to exhibit the precepts and obligations of morality in a more uſeful, practical, and popular manner; but the Engliſh and French ſurpaſſed all the moral writers of the Reformed church in penetration, ſolidity, and in the eaſe, freedom, and perſpicuity, of their method and compoſitions. MOSES AMYRAUT, a man of a ſound underſtanding and ſubtile genius, was the firſt of the French divines who diſtinguiſhed themſelves in this kind of writing. He compoſed an accurate and elaborate ſyſtem of morality, in a ſtyle, indeed, that is now become obſolete; and thoſe more moderate French writers, ſuch as LA PLACETTE and PICTET, who acquired ſuch a high and eminent reputation on account of their moral writings, owe to the excellent work now mentioned a conſiderable part of their glory. While *England* groaned under the horrors and tumults of a civil war, it was chiefly the *Preſbyterians* and *Independents* that employed their talents and their pens in promoting the cauſe of practical religion. During this unhappy period, indeed, theſe doctors were remarkable for the auſtere gravity of their manners, and for a melancholy complexion and turn of mind; and theſe appeared abundantly in their compoſitions. Some of them were penned with ſuch rigour and ſeverity, as diſcovered either a total ignorance of the preſent imperfect ſtate of humanity, or an entire want of all ſort of indulgence for its unavoidable infirmities. Others were compoſed with a ſpirit of enthuſiaſm, that betrayed an evident propenſity to the doctrine of the Myſtics. But when HOBBES appeared, the ſcene changed. A new ſet of illuſtrious and excellent writers aroſe to defend the truths of religion, and the obligations of morality, againſt this author, who aimed at the deſtruction of both, ſince he ſubjected the unchangeable nature of religion to the arbitrary will of the ſovereign, and endeavoured to efface the eternal diſtinction that there is between moral good and evil. CUDWORTH, CUMBERLAND, SHARROCK, and others, [a], alarmed at the view of a ſyſtem ſo falſe in its principles, and ſo pernicious in its effects, rendered eminent ſervice to the cauſe of religion and morals by their immortal labours, in which, ariſing to the *firſt principles of things*, and opening the primitive and eternal fountains of *truth* and *good*, they illuſtrated clearly the doctrines of the *one* with the faireſt evidence, and eſtabliſhed the obligations of the *other* on the firmeſt foundations.

The controverſies concerning Predeſtination and Grace.

X. About the commencement of this century, the academy of *Geneva* was in ſuch high repute among the Reformed churches, that it was reſorted to from all quarters by ſuch as were deſirous of a learned education; and more eſpecially by thoſe ſtudents of theology, whoſe circumſtances in life permitted them to frequent this famous ſeminary [b]. Hence it very naturally happened,

---

☞ [a] See LELAND's *View of the Deiſtical Writers*, vol. i. p. 48.

[b] The luſtre and authority of the academy of *Geneva* began gradually to decline, from the time that, the *United Provinces* being formed into a free and independent republic, univerſities were founded at *Leyden*, *Franeker*, and *Utrecht*.

that the opinions of CALVIN, concerning the *Decrees of God* and *Divine Grace*, became daily more univerſal, and were gradually introduced every where into the ſchools of learning. There was not, however, any public law or confeſſion of faith that obliged the paſtors of the Reformed churches, in any part of the world, to conform their ſentiments to the theological doctrines that were adapted and taught at *Geneva* [*c*]. And accordingly there were many, who either rejected entirely the doctrine of that academy on theſe intricate points, or received it with certain reſtrictions and modifications. Nay, even thoſe who were in general attached to the theological ſyſtem of *Geneva*, were not perfectly agreed about the manner of explaining the doctrine relating to the divine decrees. The greateſt part were of opinion, that God had only *permitted* the firſt man to fall into tranſgreſſion, without poſitively *predetermining* his fall. But others went much further, and, preſumptuouſly forgetting their own ignorance on the one hand, and the wiſdom and equity of the divine counſels on the other, maintained, that God, in order to exerciſe and diſplay his awful *juſtice* and his free *mercy*, had decreed from all eternity the tranſgreſſion of ADAM; and ſo ordered the courſe of events, that our firſt parents could not poſſibly avoid their unhappy fall. Thoſe that held this latter ſentiment were denominated *Supralapſarians*, to diſtinguiſh them from the *Sublapſarian* doctors, who maintained the doctrine of *permiſſion* already mentioned.

The Arminian ſchiſm.

XI. It is remarkable enough, that the *Supralapſarian* and *Sublapſarian* divines forgot their debates and differences, as matters of little conſequence ; and united their force againſt thoſe who thought it their duty to repreſent the Deity, as extending his goodneſs and mercy to *all mankind*. This gave riſe, ſoon after the commencement of this century, to a deplorable ſchiſm, which all the efforts of human wiſdom have ſince been unable to heal. JAMES ARMINIUS, profeſſor of divinity in the univerſity of *Leyden*, rejected the doctrine of the church of *Geneva*, in relation to the deep and intricate points of predeſtination and grace ; and maintained, with the Lutherans, that God has excluded none from ſalvation by an *abſolute* and eternal decree. He was joined in theſe ſentiments by ſeveral perſons in *Holland*, that were eminently diſtinguiſhed by the extent of their learning and the dignity of their ſtations ; but he met with the warmeſt oppoſition from FRANCIS GOMAR his colleague, and from the principal profeſſors in the Dutch univerſities. The magiſtrates exhorted the contending parties to moderation and charity ; and obſerved, that, in a free ſtate, their reſpective opinions might be treated with toleration, without any detriment to the eſſential intereſts of true religion. After long and tedious debates, which were frequently attended with popular tumults and civil broils, this intricate controverſy was, by the councils and authority [d] of MAURICE, prince of *Orange*, referred to the deciſion of the church, aſſembled, in a general ſynod at *Dort*, in the year 1618. The moſt eminent divines of the United Provinces, and not only ſo, but learned deputies from the churches

---

[*c*] See, for a full demonſtration of this aſſertion, GROTIUS's *Apologeticus*, &c. as alſo ſeveral treatiſes, written in Dutch, by THEOD. VOLKH. COORNKERT, of whom ARNOLDT makes particular mention in his *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. et Hæret.* tom. ii.

☞ [d] It was not by the authority of Prince MAURICE, but by that of the States-general, that the national ſynod was aſſembled at *Dort*. The ſtates were not indeed unanimous ; three of the ſeven provinces proteſted againſt the holding of this ſynod, *viz. Holland, Utrecht*, and *Overyſſel*.

of *England*, *Scotland*, *Switzerland*, *Bremen*, *Heſſia*, and the *Palatinate*, were preſent at this numerous and ſolemn aſſembly. It was by the ſentence of theſe judges, that the *Arminians* loſt their cauſe, and were declared corrupters of the true religion. It muſt be obſerved, at the ſame time, that the doctors of *Geneva*, who embraced the *Sublapſarian* ſyſtem, triumphed over their adverſaries in this ſynod. For though the patrons of the *Supralapſarian* cauſe were far from being contemptible either in point of number or of abilities; yet the moderation and equity of the Britiſh divines prevented the ſynod from giving its ſanction to the opinions of that preſumptuous ſect. Nor indeed would even the *Sublapſarians* have gained their point, or obtained to the full the accompliſhment of their deſires, had the doctors of *Bremen*, who for weighty reaſons were attached to the Lutherans, been able to execute their purpoſes [*e*].

The effects of this ſchiſm.

XII. It is greatly to be doubted, whether this victory gained over the Arminians, was, upon the whole, advantageous or detrimental to the church of *Geneva* in particular, and to the Reformed church in general. It is at leaſt certain, that, after the ſynod of *Dort*, the doctrine of abſolute decrees loſt ground from day to day; and its patrons were put to the hard neceſſity of holding fraternal communion with thoſe whoſe doctrine was either profeſſedly Arminian, or at leaſt nearly reſembled it. The leaders of the vanquiſhed Arminians were eminently diſtinguiſhed by their eloquence, ſagacity, and learning; and being highly exaſperated by the injurious and oppreſſive treatment they met with, in conſequence of their condemnation, they defended themſelves, and attacked their adverſaries with ſuch ſpirit and vigour, and alſo with ſuch dexterity and eloquence, that multitudes were perſuaded of the juſtice of their cauſe. It is particularly to be obſerved, that the authority of the ſynod of *Dort* was far from being univerſally acknowledged among the Dutch; the provinces of *Frieſland*, *Zealand*, *Utrecht*, *Guelderland*, and *Groningen*, could not be perſuaded to adopt its deciſions; and though, in the year 1651, they were at length gained over ſo far as to intimate, that they would ſee with pleaſure the Reformed religion maintained upon the footing on which it had been placed and confirmed by the ſynod of *Dort*, yet the moſt eminent adepts in Belgic juriſprudence deny that this intimation has the force or character of a law [*f*].

[*e*] We ſhall give, in the *Hiſtory of the Arminians*, a liſt of the writers that appeared in this controverſy; as alſo a more particular account of the tranſactions of the ſynod of *Dort*.

In *England*, the face of religion changed conſiderably, in a very little time after the famous ſynod now mentioned; and this change, which was entirely in favour of *Arminianiſm*, was principally effected by the counſels and influence of WILLIAM LAUD, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*. This revolution gave new courage to the Arminians; and, from that period to the preſent time, they have had the pleaſure of ſeeing the deciſions and doctrines of the ſynod of *Dort*, relating to the points in debate between them and the Calviniſts, treated, in *England*, with ſomething more than mere indifference, beheld by ſome with averſion, and by others with contempt [*g*]. And indeed, if we conſider the genius and ſpirit of the church of *England* during this period, we ſhall plainly ſee,

---

[*f*] See the very learned and illuſtrious Preſident BYNKERSHOEK'S *Quæſtiones Juris publici*, lib. ii. cap. xviii.

[*g*] SEV. LINTRUPII *Diſſertatio de Contemptu Concilii Dordrac. in Angliâ*, in *Diſſert. Theologicis* HECT. GODOFR. MASII, tom. i. n. xix.

that the doctrine of the *Gomariſts*, concerning Predeſtination and Grace, could not meet there with a favourable reception, ſince the leading doctors of that church were zealous in modelling its doctrine and diſcipline after the ſentiments and inſtitutions that were received in the primitive times, and ſince thoſe early *fathers*, whom they followed with a profound ſubmiſſion, had never preſumed, before AUGUSTINE, to ſet limits to the extent of the divine grace and mercy.

The Reformed churches in *France* ſeemed, at firſt, diſpoſed to give a favourable reception to the deciſions of this famous ſynod; but, as theſe deciſions were highly diſpleaſing to the votaries of *Rome* among whom they lived, and kindled anew their rage againſt the Proteſtants, the latter thought it their duty to be circumſpect in this matter; and, in proceſs of time, their real ſentiments, and the doctrines they taught, began to differ extremely from thoſe of the *Gomariſts*. The churches of *Brandenberg* and *Bremen*, which made a conſiderable figure among the *Reformed* in *Germany*, would never ſuffer their doctors to be tied down to the opinions and tenets of the Dutch divines. And thus it happened, that the liberty of private judgment (with reſpect to the doctrines of Predeſtination and Grace), which the ſpirit that prevailed among the divines of *Dort* ſeemed ſo much adapted to ſuppreſs or diſcourage, acquired rather new vigour, in conſequence of the arbitrary proceedings of that aſſembly; and the Reformed church was immediately divided into *Univerſaliſts*, *Semiuniverſaliſts*, *Supralapſarians*, and *Sublapſarians*, who, indeed, notwithſtanding their diſſenſions, which ſometimes become violent and tumultuous, live generally in the exerciſe of mutual toleration, and are reciprocally reſtrained by many reaſons from indulging a ſpirit of hoſtility and perſecution. What is ſtill more remarkable, and therefore ought not to be paſſed over in ſilence, we ſee the city of *Geneva*, which was the parent, the nurſe, and the guardian of the doctrine of *Abſolute Predeſtination*, and *Particular Grace*, not only put on ſentiments of charity, forbearance, and eſteem for the Arminians, but become itſelf almoſt ſo far Arminian, as to deſerve a place among the churches of that communion.

The particular tenets of the Reformed churches in *France*.

XIII. While the Reformed churches in *France* yet ſubſiſted, its doctors departed, in ſeveral points, from the common rule of faith that was received in the other churches of their communion. This, as appears from ſeveral circumſtances, was, in a great meaſure, owing to their deſire of diminiſhing the prejudices of the Roman-catholics againſt them, and of getting rid of a part of the odious concluſions which were drawn by their adverſaries from the doctrines of *Dort*, and laid to their charge with that malignity which popiſh bigotry ſo naturally inſpires. Hence we find in the books that were compoſed by the doctors of *Saumur* and *Sedan*, after the ſynod of *Dort*, many things which ſeem conformable, not only to the ſentiments of the Lutherans, concerning *Grace*, *Predeſtination*, the *Perſon of Chriſt*, and the *Efficacy of the ſacraments*, but alſo to certain peculiar opinions of the Romiſh church. This moderation may be dated from the year 1615, when the opinion of JOHN PISCATOR, paſtor at *Herborn*, concerning the *Obedience of Chriſt*, was tacitly adopted, or at leaſt pronounced free from error, by the ſynod of the iſle of *France* [h]; though it had been formerly condemned and rejected in ſeveral preceding aſſemblies of the ſame nature [i]. PISCATOR maintained, that it was not by his obedience to the divine law that CHRIST made a ſatisfaction to that law in our ſtead, ſince this obedience was his duty conſidered as a man; and therefore, being obliged to obey this law himſelf, his obſervance of it could not merit any thing for others from the Supreme Being. This opinion, as every one may ſee, tended to confirm the doctrine of the Romiſh church, concerning the *Merit of good works*, the *Natural power of man to obey the commands of God*, and other points of a like nature [*ii*]. Theſe leſs important conceſſions were

---

[h] AYMON, *Actes de tous les Synodes Nationaux des Egliſes Reformées de France*, tom. ii. p. 275, 276.

[i] See AYMON, *loc. cit.* tom. i. p. 400, 401. 457. tom. ii. p. 13.—BOSSUET, *Hiſtoire des Variations des Egliſes Proteſtantes*, livr.

---

livr. xiii. tom. ii. p. 268. where this prelate, with his uſual malignity and bitterneſs, reproaches the Proteſtants with their inconſtancy. The learned BASNAGE has endeavoured to defend the Reformed churches againſt this charge, in the ſecond volume of his *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, p. 1533. But this defence is not ſatisfactory. ☞ To Dr. MOSHEIM, who ſpeaks more than once of the Reformed church and its doctors with partiality and prejudice, this defence may not appear ſatisfactory; it has, nevertheleſs, been judged ſo by many perſons of uncommon diſcernment; and we invite the reader to judge for himſelf.

[*ii*] ☞ It does not appear to me that any one, who looks with an unprejudiced eye, can ſee the leaſt connection between the opinion of PISCATOR (which I ſhall not here either refute or defend), and the Popiſh doctrine which maintains the *merit of good works*: for though we are not juſtified (i. e. pardoned or treated as if we had not offended) in conſequence of Chriſt's active obedience to the Divine Law, yet we may be ſo by his death and ſufferings; and it is really to theſe, that the ſcriptures, in many places, aſcribe our acceptance. Now a perſon who aſcribes his acceptance and ſalvation to the death and mediation of Chriſt, does not ſurely give any countenance to the doctrine of the ſtrict and rigorous merit of works, although he ſhould not be ſo *ſharp-ſighted* as to perceive the influence which certain doctors attribute to, what is called, Chriſt's *active obedience*. But let it be obſerved here, in a particular mnnner, that the opinion of PISCATOR is much more unfavourable to Popery than our author imagined, ſince it overturns totally, by a direct and moſt natural conſequence, the popiſh doctrine concerning *works of Supererogation*, which is as monſtrous an abſurdity in morals, as Tranſubſtantiation is in the eſtimation of common ſenſe. For if Chriſt, in his *univerſal* and *perfect* obedience to the divine laws, did no more than he was *morally obliged*

were followed by others of a much more weighty and momentous kind, of which ſome were ſo erroneous, that they were highly diſliked and rejected, even by thoſe of the French Proteſtants themſelves, who were the moſt remarkable for their moderation, charity, and love of peace [*k*].

XIV. The doctors of *Saumur* revived a controverſy, that had for ſome time been ſuſpended,

The controverſy excited by the Hypothetical Univerſaliſts.

---

obliged to do by his character as a *man*, is it not abſurd, if not impious, to ſeek in the virtue of the Romiſh ſaints (all of whom were very imperfect, and ſome of them very worthleſs mortals) an exuberance of obedience, a *ſuperabundant* quantity of virtue, to which *they* were not obliged, and which they are ſuppoſed to depoſit in the hands of the Popes, who are empowered to diſtribute it, for love of money, among ſuch as have need of it to make up their accounts?

☞ [*k*] This affirmation is groundleſs, and I wiſh it were not liable to the charge of malignity. The accuſation that Dr. MOSHEIM brings here againſt the Reformed churches in *France* is of too ſerious a nature not to require the moſt evident and circumſtantial proofs. He has, however, alleged none, nor has he given any one inſtance of thoſe *weighty and momentous conceſſions* that were made to popery. It was not, indeed, in his power either to give arguments or examples of a ſatisfactory kind; and it is highly probable, that the unguarded words of ELIAS SAURIN, miniſter of *Utrecht*, in relation to the learned LEWIS LE BLANC, profeſſor of *Sedan* (which dropt from the pen of the former, in his *Examen de la Théologie de M.* JURIEU), are the only teſtimony Dr. MOSHEIM had to allege, in ſupport of an accuſation, which he has not limited to any one perſon, but inconſiderately thrown out upon the French churches in general. Thoſe who are deſirous of a full illuſtration of this matter, and yet have not an opportunity of conſulting the original ſources of information, may ſatisfy their curioſity by peruſing the articles BEAULIEU and AMYRAUT, in BAYLE's *Dictionary*; and the articles PAJON and PAPIN, in M. DE CHAUFFEPIED's Supplement to that work. Any conceſſions that ſeem to have been made by the Proteſtant doctors in *France* to their adverſaries, conſiſted in giving an Arminian turn to ſome of the more rigid tenets of CALVIN, relating to *Original Sin*, *Predeſtination* and *Grace*; and this turn would, undoubtedly, have been given to theſe doctrines, had popery been out of the queſtion. But theſe conceſſions are not certainly what our hiſtorian had in view; nor would he, in effect, have treated ſuch conceſſions as erroneous.

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART II.

by their attempts to reconcile the doctrine of Predeſtination, as it had been taught at *Geneva*, and confirmed at *Dort*, with the ſentiments of thoſe who repreſent the Deity as offering the diſplays of his goodneſs and mercy to all mankind. The firſt perſon who made this fruitleſs attempt was JOHN CAMERON, whoſe ſentiments were ſupported and further illuſtrated by MOSES AMYRAUT, a man of uncommon ſagacity and erudition. The latter applied himſelf, from the year 1634, with unparalleled zeal, to this arduous work, and diſplayed in it extraordinary exertions of capacity and genius; and ſo ardently was he bent on bringing it into execution, that he made, for this purpoſe, no ſmall changes in the doctrine commonly received among the Reformed in *France*. The form of doctrine he had ſtruck out, in order to accompliſh this important reconciliation, may be briefly ſummed up in the following propoſitions: "That God *deſires* the happineſs of all men, and "that no mortal is excluded, *by any divine decree*, "from the benefits that are procured by the "death, ſufferings, and Goſpel of CHRIST;

"That, however, none can be made a partaker of the bleſſings of the Goſpel, and of "eternal ſalvation, unleſs he *believe* in JESUS "CHRIST;

"That ſuch indeed is the immenſe and univerſal goodneſs of the Supreme Being, that he "*refuſes* to *none* the *power* of *believing*; though he "does not grant unto *all* his aſſiſtance and ſuccour, that they may wiſely improve this *power* "to the attainment of everlaſting ſalvation;

"And that, in conſequence of this, multitudes "periſh, through their own fault, and not from "any want of goodneſs in God [*l*]."

Thoſe

[*l*] See JO. WOLFG. JAEGERI *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. et Politica, Sæculi* xvii. *Decenn.* iv. p. 522.

☞ This

Thoſe who embraced this doctrine were called *Univerſaliſts*, becauſe they repreſented God as willing to ſhew mercy to *all* mankind; and *Hypothetical Univerſaliſts*, becauſe the *condition* of faith in CHRIST was neceſſary to render them the objects of this mercy. It is the opinion of many, that this doctrine differs but little from that which was eſtabliſhed by the ſynod of *Dort*; but ſuch do not ſeem to have attentively conſidered either the principles from whence it is derived, or the conſequences to which it leads. The more I examine this reconciling ſyſtem, the more I am perſuaded, that it is no more than Arminianiſm or Pelagianiſm artfully dreſſed up, and ingeniouſly covered with a half-tranſparent veil of ſpecious, but ambiguous expreſſions; and this judgment is confirmed by the language that is uſed in treating this ſubject by the modern followers of AMYRAUT, who expreſs their ſentiments with more courage,

---

☞ This mitigated view of the doctrine of Predeſtination has only one defect; but it is a capital one. It repreſents God, as *deſiring* a thing (i. e. ſalvation and happineſs) for ALL, which in order to its attainment requires a *degree* of his aſſiſtance and ſuccour which he *refuſeth* to MANY. This rendered grace and redemption *univerſal* only in words, but *partial* in reality; and therefore did not at all mend the matter. The *Supralapſarians* were conſiſtent with themſelves, but their doctrine was harſh and terrible, and was founded on the moſt unworthy notions of the Supreme Being; and, on the other hand, the ſyſtem of AMYRAUT was full of inconſiſtencies; nay, even the *Sublapſarian* doctrine has its difficulties, and rather palliates, than removes the horrors of *Supralapſarianiſm*. What then is to be done? from what quarter ſhall the candid and well-diſpoſed Chriſtian receive that ſolid ſatisfaction and wiſe direction, which neither of theſe ſyſtems is adapted to adminiſter? Theſe he will receive by turning his dazzled and feeble eye from the *ſecret* decrees of God, which were neither deſigned to be *rules* of action nor *ſources* of comfort to mortals here below; and by fixing his view upon the mercy of God, as it is manifeſted through Chriſt, the pure laws and ſublime promiſes of his Goſpel, and the reſpectable equity of his preſent government and his future tribunal.

plainneſs, and perſpicuity, than the ſpirit of the times permitted their maſter to do. A cry was raiſed, in ſeveral French ſynods, againſt the doctrine of AMYRAUT; but, after it had been carefully examined by *them*, and defended by *him* at their public meetings with his uſual eloquence and erudition, he was honourably acquitted [m]. The oppoſition he met with from *Holland* was ſtill more formidable, as it came from the learned and celebrated pens of RIVET, SPANHEIM, DES MARETS, and other adverſaries of note; he nevertheleſs anſwered them with great ſpirit and vigour, and his cauſe was powerfully ſupported afterwards by DAILLE, BLONDEL, MESTREZAT, and CLAUDE [n]. This controverſy was carried on, for a long time, with great animoſity and little fruit to thoſe who oppoſed the opinions of the French innovator. For the ſentiments of AMYRAUT were not only received in all the univerſities of the Hugonots in *France*, and adopted by divines of the higheſt note in that nation, but alſo ſpread themſelves as far as *Geneva*, and were afterwards diſſeminated by the French Proteſtants, who fled from the rage of perſecution, through all the Reformed churches of *Europe*. And they now are ſo generally received, that few have the courage to oppoſe or decry them.

The conteſts occaſioned by De la Place and Cappel.

XV. The deſire of mitigating certain doctrines of the Reformed church, that drew upon it the heavieſt cenſures from both the Roman-catholics and ſome Proteſtant communions, was the true origin of the opinion propagated, in the year 1640, by DE LA PLACE, concerning the imputation of original ſin. This divine, who was the intimate friend of AMYRAUT, and his colleague at *Saumur*, rejected the opinion generally received in the ſchools of the Reformed, that *the perſonal and actual tranſgreſſion of the firſt man is imputed to his poſterity.* He maintained, on the contrary, that God imputes to every man his natural corruption, his perſonal guilt, and his propenſity to ſin; or, to ſpeak in the theological ſtyle, he affirmed, that *original ſin is indirectly and not directly imputed to mankind.* This opinion was condemned as erroneous, in the year 1642, by the ſynod of *Charenton*, and many Dutch and Helvetic doctors of great name ſet themſelves to refute it [*o*]; while the love of peace and union prevented its author from defending it in a public and open manner [*p*]. But neither the ſentence of the ſynod, nor the ſilence of DE LA PLACE, could hinder this ſentiment from making a deep impreſſion on the minds of many, who looked upon it as conformable to the plaineſt dictates of juſtice and equity; nor could they prevent its being tranſmitted, with the French exiles, into other countries.

---

[m] See AYMON, *Actes des Synodes Nationaux des Egliſes Reformées en France*, tom. ii. p. 571. p. 604.—BLONDEL, *Actes Authentiques des Egliſes Reformées touchant la paix et la charité fraternelle*, p. 19.—82—Edit. of *Amſterdam* publiſhed in 4to, in the year 1655.

[n] BAYLE's *Dictionary*, vol. i. at the articles AMYRAUT and BLONDEL; and vol. ii. at the article DAILLE.—See CHRIST. PFAFFIUS, *De formula conſenſus*, cap. i. p. 4.

In the claſs of thoſe who, to diminiſh or avoid the reſentment of the papiſts, made conceſſions inconſiſtent with truth, and detrimental to the purity of the Proteſtant religion, many place LEWIS CAPPEL, profeſſor at *Saumur*, who, in a voluminous and elaborate work [*q*], undertook to prove that the Hebrew points were not uſed by the ſacred writers, and were a modern invention added to the text by the Maſorethes [r]. It is at leaſt certain, that this hypotheſis was highly agreeable to the votaries of *Rome*, and ſeemed manifeſtly adapted to diminiſh the authority of the holy Scriptures, and to put them upon a level with oral tradition, if not to render their deciſions ſtill leſs reſpectable and certain [s]. On theſe accounts, the ſyſtem of this famous profeſſor was oppoſed, with the moſt ardent efforts of erudition and zeal, by ſeveral doctors both of the Reformed and Lutheran churches, who were eminent for their knowledge of the Hebrew language, and their acquaintance with Oriental learning in general [t].

[*o*] AYMON, *Synodes des Egliſes Reformées de France*, tom. ii. p. 680.

[*p*] CHRIST. EBERH. WEISMANNI *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Sæc.* xvii. p. 817.

[*q*] This work, which is entitled, *Arcanum Punctuationis Revelatum*, is ſtill extant, with its *Vindiciæ*, in the works of CAPPEL, printed at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1689, in *folio*, and in the *Critica Sacra* V. T. publiſhed in *folio* at *Paris*, 1650.

Lewis le Blanc.

XVI. Though theſe great men gave offence to many, by the freedom and novelty of their ſentiments, yet they had the approbation and eſteem of the greateſt part of the Reformed churches; and the equity of ſucceeding generations removed the aſperſions that envy had thrown upon them during their lives, and made ample amends for

---

☞ [r] It was alſo CAPPEL who affirmed, that the characters, which compoſe the Hebrew text, were thoſe that the Chaldeans uſed after the Babyloniſh captivity, the Jews having always made uſe of the Samaritan characters before that period.

☞ [s] This abſurd notion of the tendency of CAPPEL's hypotheſis is now hiſſed almoſt entirely out of the learned world. Be that as it may, the hypotheſis in queſtion is by no means peculiar to CAPPEL; it was adopted by LUTHER, ZUINGLE, CALVIN, the three great pillars of the Reformation; as alſo by MUNSTER, OLIVETAN, MASIUS, SCALIGER, CASAUBON, DRUSIUS, DE DIEU, WALTON, and BOCHART, thoſe eminent men, who have caſt ſuch light on ſacred philology; ſo that CAPPEL had only the merit of ſupporting it by new arguments, and placing it in a ſtriking and luminous point of view.

[t] See B. Jo. CHRIST. WOLFII *Biblioth. Hebraica*, p. ii. p. 27.

the injuries they had received from ſeveral of their cotemporaries. This was far from being the caſe of thoſe doctors who either openly attempted to bring about a complete reconciliation and union between the Reformed and Romiſh churches, or explained the doctrines of Chriſtianity in a ſuch a manner as leſſened the difference between the two communions, and thereby rendered the paſſage from the former to the latter leſs diſguſting and painful. The attempts of theſe peace-makers were looked upon as odious, and in the iſſue they proved utterly unſucceſsful. The moſt eminent of theſe reconciling doctors were LEWIS LE BLANC, profeſſor at *Sedan*, and CLAUDE PAJON, miniſter of *Orleans* [*u*], who were both remarkable for the perſuaſive power of their eloquence, and diſcovered an uncommon degree of penetration and ſagacity in their writings and negociations. The former paſſed in review many of the controverſies that divide the two churches, and ſeemed to prove, with the utmoſt perſpicuity, that ſome of them were merely diſputes about words, and that the others were of much leſs conſequence than was generally imagined [*w*]. This manner of ſtating the differences between the two churches drew upon LE BLANC the indignation of thoſe,

---

☞ [*u*] It is difficult to conceive, what could engage Dr. MOSHEIM to place PAJON in the claſs of thoſe who explained the doctrines of Chriſtianity in ſuch a manner, as to diminiſh the difference between the doctrine of the Reformed and Romiſh churches. PAJON was, indeed, a moderate divine, and leaned ſomewhat towards the Arminian ſyſtem; and this propenſity was not uncommon among the French Proteſtants. But few doctors of this time wrote with more learning, zeal, and judgment, againſt popery, than CLAUDE PAJON, as appears from his excellent treatiſe againſt NICOLE, entitled, *Examen du Livre, qui porte pour titre préjugées légitimes contre les Calviniſtes.*

[*w*] In his *Theſes Theologicæ*, which have paſſed through ſeveral editions, and are highly worthy of an attentive peruſal. They were twice printed at *London*.

who looked upon all attempts to ſoften and modify controverted doctrines as dangerous and detrimental to the cauſe of truth [x]. On the other hand, the acuteneſs and dexterity with which he treated this nice matter, made a conſiderable impreſſion upon ſeveral perſons, and procured him diſciples, who ſtill entertain his reconciling ſentiments, but either conceal them entirely, or diſcover them with caution, as they are known to be diſpleaſing to the greateſt part of the members of both communions.

Claude Pajon.

XVII. The modifications under which PAJON exhibited ſome of the doctrines of the Reformed church, were alſo extremely offenſive and unpopular. This eccleſiaſtic applied the principles and tenets of the Carteſian philoſophy, of which he was a warm and able defender, in explaining the opinions of that church relating to the corruption of human nature, the ſtate of its moral faculties and powers, the grace of God, and the converſion of ſinners; and, in the judgment of many, he gave an erroneous interpretation of theſe opinions. It is, indeed, very difficult to determine what were the real ſentiments of this man; nor is it eaſy to ſay, whether this difficulty be moſt owing to the affected obſcurity and ambiguity under which he diſguiſed them, or to the inaccuracy with which his adverſaries, through negligence or malignity, have repreſented them. If we may give credit to the latter, his doctrine amounts to the following propoſitions: "That
" the corruption of man is leſs, and his natural
" power to amend his ways greater, than is ge-
" nerally imagined:—That *original ſin* lies in
" the *underſtanding* alone, and conſiſts principally
" in the obſcurity and imperfection of our ideas
" of divine things:—That this imperfection of

---

[x] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article BEAULIEU.

" the human underſtanding has a pernicious influence upon the *will*, excites in it vicious propenſities, and thus leads it to ſinful actions:—That this internal diſorder is healed, not by the mere efforts of our *natural faculties* and powers, but by the aſſiſtance and *energy* of the *Holy Spirit*, operating upon the mind by the *divine word* as its *mean* or inſtrument:—That, however, this word is not endowed with any divine intrinſic energy, either *natural* or *ſupernatural*, but only with a *moral influence*, i. e. that it corrects and improves the underſtanding, in the ſame manner as human truth does, even by imparting clear and diſtinct notions of ſpiritual and divine things, and furniſhing ſolid arguments for the truth and divinity of the Chriſtian religion, and its perfect conformity with the dictates of right reaſon:—And that, of conſequence, every man, if no internal or external impediments deſtroy or ſuſpend the exertion of his natural powers and faculties, may, by the *uſe of his own reaſon*, and a careful and aſſiduous *ſtudy of the revealed will of God*, be *enabled* to correct what is amiſs in his ſentiments, affections, and actions, *without any extraordinary aſſiſtance from the Holy Ghoſt* [y]."

Such is the account of the opinions of PAJON that is given by his adverſaries. On the other hand, if we take our ideas of his doctrine from himſelf, we ſhall find this account diſingenuous and erroneous. PAJON intimates plainly his aſſent to the doctrines that were confirmed by the ſynod of *Dort*, and that are contained in the catechiſms and confeſſions of faith of the Reformed churches; he complains that his doctrine has been ill underſtood or wilfully perverted; and he obſerves, that he did not deny entirely an *immediate operation of the Holy Spirit* on the minds of thoſe that are really converted to God, but only ſuch an *immediate operation* as was not accompanied with the miniſtry and efficacy of the divine word; or, to expreſs the matter in other terms, he declared that he could not adopt the ſentiments of thoſe who repreſent that *word* as no more than an *inſtrument* void of intrinſic efficacy, *a mere external ſign* of an *immediate operation of the Spirit of God* [z]. This laſt declaration is, however, both obſcure and captious. Be that as it may, PAJON concludes by obſerving, that we ought not to diſpute about the *manner* in which the Holy Spirit operates upon the minds of men, but content ourſelves with acknowledging, that he is the true and original Author of all that is good in the affections of our heart, and the actions that proceed from them. Notwithſtanding theſe declarations, the doctrine of this learned and ingenious eccleſiaſtic was not only looked upon as heterodox by ſome of the moſt eminent divines of the Reformed church, but was alſo condemned, in the year 1677, by ſeveral ſynods in *France*, and, in 1686, by a ſynod aſſembled at *Rotterdam*.

---

[y] FRED. SPANHEIM, *Append. ad Elenchum Controverſiar.* tom. iii. opp. p. 882.—JURIEU, *Traité de la Nature et de la Grace*, p. 35.—VAL. ERN. LOſCHERI *Exercit. de* CLAUD. PAJONII *ejuſque ſectator. doctrina et fatis. Lipſ.* 1692.

Papin.

XVIII. This controverſy, which ſeemed to be brought to a concluſion by the death of PAJON, was revived, or rather continued, by ISAAC PAPIN, his nephew, a native of *Blois*, who, by his writings and travels, was highly inſtrumental in communicating to *England*, *Holland*, and *Germany*, the contagion of theſe unhappy debates. This eccleſiaſtic expreſſed his ſentiments without ambiguity or reſerve, and propagated every where the doctrine of his uncle, which, according to his crude and harſh manner of repreſenting it, he reduced to the two following propoſitions:

---

[z] All theſe declarations made by PAJON may be ſeen in a confeſſion of his faith, ſuppoſed to have been drawn up by himſelf, and publiſhed by the learned M. DE CHAUFFEPIED, in his *Nouveau Dictionaire Hiſtor. et Critique*, tom. ii. p. 164. in note (*c*) of the article LE CENE.

"*That the natural powers and faculties of man are more than ſufficient to lead him to the knowledge of divine truth:*

"*That, in order to produce that amendment of the heart, which is called* REGENERATION, *nothing more is requiſite than to put the body, if its habit is bad, into a ſound ſtate by the power of phyſic, and then to ſet truth and falſhood before the* UNDERSTANDING, *and virtue and vice before the* WILL, *in their genuine colours, clearly and diſtinctly, ſo as that their nature and properties may be fully apprehended.*"

This and the other opinions of PAPIN were refuted, with a conſiderable degree of acrimony, in the year 1686, by the famous JURIEU, profeſſor of divinity and paſtor of the French church at *Rotterdam*, and they were condemned the year following by the ſynod of *Boiſleduc*. In the year 1688, they were condemned, with ſtill greater marks of ſeverity, by the French ſynod at the *Hague*, where a ſentence of excommunication was pronounced againſt their author. Exaſperated at theſe proceedings, PAPIN returned into *France* in the year 1690, where he abjured publicly the Proteſtant religion, and embraced the communion of the church of *Rome*, in which he died in the year 1709 [*a*]. It has been affirmed by ſome, that this ingenious man was treated with great rigour and injuſtice; and that his theological opinions were unfaithfully repreſented by his violent and unrelenting adverſary, JURIEU, whoſe warmth and impetuoſity in religious controverſy are well known. How far this affirmation may be ſupported by evidence, we cannot pretend to determine. A doctrine, ſomething like that of PAJON, was maintained in ſeveral treatiſes, in the year 1684, by CHARLES LE CENE, a French divine of uncommon learning and ſagacity, who gave a new and very ſingular tranſlation of the Bible [b]. But he entirely rejected the doctrine of *Original Sin*, and of the importance of human nature; and aſſerted, that it was in every man's power to amend his ways, and arrive at a ſtate of obedience and virtue, by the mere uſe of his natural faculties, and an attentive ſtudy of the divine word; more eſpecially, if theſe were ſeconded by the advantage of a good education, and the influence of virtuous examples. Hence ſeveral divines pretend that his doctrine is, in many reſpects, different from that of PAJON [c].

[*a*] See JURIEU, *De la Nature et de la Grace.*—MOLLERI *Cimbria Literat.* tom. ii. p. 608.

Le Cene.

The ſtate of the church of *England* under James I.

XIX. The church of *England* had, for a long time, reſembled a ſhip toſſed on a boiſterous and tempeſtuous ocean. The oppoſition of the *Papiſts* on the one hand, and the diſcontents and remonſtrances of the *Puritans* on the other, had kept it in a perpetual ferment. When, on the death of ELIZABETH, JAMES I. aſcended the throne, theſe latter conceived the warmeſt hopes of ſeeing more ſerene and proſperous days, and of being delivered from the vexations and oppreſſions they were conſtantly expoſed to, on account of their attachment to the diſcipline and worſhip of the church of *Geneva*. Theſe hopes were ſo much the more natural, as the king had received his education in *Scotland*, where the *Puritans* prevailed, and had, on ſome occaſions, made the ſtrongeſt declarations of his attachment to their eccleſiaſtical conſtitution [*d*]. And ſome of the firſt ſteps taken by this prince ſeemed to encourage theſe hopes, as he appeared deſirous of aſſuming the character and office of an arbitrator, in order to accommodate matters between the church and the Puritans [*e*]. But theſe expectations ſoon vaniſhed, and, under the government of JAMES, things put on a new face. As the deſire of unlimited power and authority was the reign-

---

[b] This tranſlation was publiſhed at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1741, and was condemned by the French ſynod in *Holland*.

[c] See the learned and laborious M. CHAUFFEPIED'S *Nouv. Diction. Hiſt. et Critiq.* tom. ii. p. 160. at the article LE CENE.

☞ [*d*] In a General Aſſembly held at *Edinburgh*, in the year 1590, this prince is ſaid to have made the following public declaration: "I praiſe God that I was born in the time of the "light of the Goſpel, and in ſuch a place as to be the king of "the ſincereſt (i. e. *pureſt*) kirk in the world. The kirk of "*Geneva* keep paſche and yule (i. e. *Eaſter* and *Chriſtmas*). "What have they for them? They have no inſtitution. As "for our neighbour kirk of *England*, their ſervice is an evil-"ſaid maſs in Engliſh; they want nothing of the maſs but the "liftings (i. e. *the elevation of the hoſt*). I charge you, my "good miniſters, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and ba-"rons, to ſtand to your purity, and to exhort your people to "do the ſame; and I forſooth, as long as I brook my life, "ſhall do the ſame." CALDERWOOD'*s Hiſtory of the Church of Scotland*, p. 256.

☞ [*e*] The religious diſputes between the church and the Puritans induced JAMES to appoint a conference between the two parties at *Hampton-Court*; at which nine biſhops, and as many dignitaries of the church, appeared on the one ſide, and four puritan miniſters on the other. The king himſelf took a conſiderable part in the controverſy againſt the latter: and this was an occupation well adapted to his taſte; for nothing could be more pleaſing to this royal pedant, than to dictate magiſterially to an aſſembly of divines concerning points of faith and diſcipline, and to receive the applauſes of theſe holy men for his ſuperior zeal and learning. The conference continued three days. The firſt day it was held between the king and the biſhops and deans, to whom JAMES propoſed ſome objections againſt certain expreſſions in the liturgy, and a few alterations in the ritual of the church; in conſequence of which, ſome ſlight alterations were made. The two following days ing paſſion in the heart of this monarch, ſo all his meaſures, whether of a civil or religious nature, were calculated to anſwer the purpoſes of his ambition. The *Preſbyterian* form of eccleſiaſtical government ſeemed leſs favourable to his views than the *epiſcopal hierarchy*; as the former exhibits a kind of *republic*, which is adminiſtered by various rulers of equal authority; while the latter approaches much nearer to the ſpirit and genius of *monarchy*. The very name of a *republic*, *ſynod*, or *council*, was odious to JAMES, who dreaded every thing that had a popular aſpect; hence he diſtinguiſhed the biſhops with peculiar marks of his favour, extended their authority, increaſed their prerogatives, and publicly adopted and inculcated the following maxim, *No biſhop, no king.* At the ſame time, as the church of *England* had not yet abandoned the Calviniſtical doctrines of *Predeſtination* and *Grace*, he alſo adhered to them for ſome time, and gave his theological repreſentatives, in the ſynod of *Dort*, an order to join in the condemnation of the ſentiments of ARMINIUS, in relation to theſe deep and intricate points.

---

the Puritans were admitted, whoſe propoſals and remonſtrances may be ſeen in NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 15. Dr. WARNER, in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of England*, obſerves, that this author muſt be read with caution, on account of his unfairneſs and partiality; why therefore did he not take his account of the *Hampton-Court* conference from a better ſource? The different accounts of the oppoſite parties, and more particularly thoſe publiſhed by Dr. BARLOW, dean of *Cheſter*, on the one hand, and PATRICK GALLOWAY, a Scots writer, on the other, (both of whom were preſent at the conference), muſt be carefully conſulted, in order to our forming a proper idea of theſe theological tranſactions. JAMES at leaſt obtained, on this occaſion, the applauſe he had in view. The Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* (WHITGIFT) ſaid, *That undoubtedly his majeſty ſpoke by the ſpecial aſſiſtance of God's ſpirit*; and BANCROFT, falling on his knees, with his eyes raiſed to — JAMES, expreſſed himſelf thus: *I proteſt my heart melteth for joy, that Almighty God, of his ſingular mercy, has given us ſuch a king, as ſince Chriſt's time has not been.*

Abbot, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, a man of remarkable gravity [*f*], and eminent zeal both for civil and religious liberty, whoſe lenity towards their

---

☞ [*f*] Lord Clarendon ſays, in his Hiſtory of the Rebellion, that "Abbot was a man of very moroſe manners, "and of a very ſowre aſpect, which at that time was called "*Gravity*." If, in general, we ſtrike a medium between what Clarendon and Neal ſay of this prelate, we ſhall probably arrive at the true knowledge of his character. See the *Hiſtory of the Rebellion*, vol. i. p. 88. and Neal's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 243. It is certain, that nothing can be more unjuſt and partial than Clarendon's account of this eminent prelate, particularly when he ſays, that *he neither underſtood nor regarded the conſtitution of the church*. But it is too much the cuſtom of this writer, and others of his ſtamp, to give the denomination of latitudinarian indifference to that charity, prudence, and moderation, by which alone the *beſt intereſts* of the church (though not the perſonal views of many of its ambitious members) can be eſtabliſhed upon *firm* and *permanent* foundations. Abbot would have been reckoned a good churchman by ſome, if he had breathed that ſpirit of deſpotiſm and violence, which, being eſſentially incompatible with the ſpirit and character of a people not only free, but jealous of their liberty, has often endangered the church, by exciting that reſentment which always renders oppoſition exceſſive. Abbot was ſo far from being indifferent about the *conſtitution of the church*, or inclined to the *Preſbyterian diſcipline* (as this noble author affirms in his *Hiſtory of the Rebellion*), that it was by his zeal and dexterity that the clergy of *Scotland*, who had refuſed to admit the Biſhops as moderators in their church-ſynods, were brought to a more tractable temper, and things put into ſuch a ſituation as afterwards produced the entire eſtabliſhment of the epiſcopal order in that nation. It is true, that Abbot's zeal in this affair was conducted with great prudence and moderation, and it was by theſe that his zeal was rendered ſucceſsful. Nor have theſe his tranſactions in *Scotland*, where he went as chaplain to the Lord High Treaſurer Dunbar, been ſufficiently attended to by hiſtorians; nay, they ſeem to have been entirely unknown to ſome, who have pretended to depreciate the conduct and principles of this virtuous and excellent prelate. King James, who had been ſo zealous a Preſbyterian in appearance before his acceſſion to the Crown of *England*, had ſcarcely ſet his foot out of *Scotland*, when he conceived the deſign of reſtoring the ancient form of epiſcopal government in that kingdom; and it was Abbot's tranſactions there that brought him to that high favour with the their anceſtors the *Puritans* ſtill celebrate in the higheſt ſtrains [g], uſed his utmoſt endeavours

---

the king, which, in the ſpace of little more than three years, raiſed him from the deanry of *Wincheſter* to the ſee of *Canterbury*. For it was by ABBOT's mild and prudent counſels, that DUNBAR procured that famous act of the General Aſſembly of *Scotland*, by which it was provided, "that the King ſhould have the calling of all general aſſemblies—that the biſhops (or their deputies) ſhould be perpetual moderators of the Dioceſian ſynods—that no excommunication ſhould be pronounced without their approbation—that all preſentations of benefices ſhould be made by them—that the deprivation or ſuſpenſion of miniſters ſhould belong to them—that the viſitation of the dioceſe ſhould be performed by the biſhop or his deputy only—and that the biſhop ſhould be moderator of all conventions for exerciſings or *propheſyings* (i. e. preaching) within their bounds." See CALDERWOOD's *True Hiſtory of the Church of Scotland*, fol. 1680. 588, 589. HEYLIN's *Hiſtory of the Preſbyterians*, p. 381, 382. and, above all, SPEED's *Hiſtory of Great Britain*, Book x. fol. 1227. The writers who ſeem the leaſt diſpoſed to ſpeak favourably of this wiſe and good prelate bear teſtimony, nevertheleſs, to his eminent piety, his exemplary converſation, and his inflexible probity and integrity: and it may be ſaid with truth, that, if his moderate meaſures had been purſued, the liberties of *England* would have been ſecured, Popery diſcountenanced, and the church prevented from running into thoſe exceſſes which afterwards proved ſo fatal to it. If ABBOT's candour failed him on any occaſion, it was in the repreſentations, which his rigid attachment, not to the *diſcipline*, but to the *doctrinal* tenets of Calviniſm, led him to give of the Arminian doctors. There is a remarkable inſtance of this in a letter of his to Sir RALPH WINWOOD, dated at *Lambeth* the 1ſt of June 1613, and occaſioned by the arrival of GROTIUS in *England*, who had been expreſsly ſent from *Holland*, by the Remonſtrants or Arminians, to mitigate the king's diſpleaſure and antipathy againſt that party. In this letter, the archbiſhop repreſents GROTIUS (with whom he certainly was not worthy to be named, either in point of learning, ſagacity, or judgment) as a *Pedant*; and mentions, with a high degree of complacence and approbation, the abſurd and impertinent judgment of ſome civilians and divines, who called this immortal ornament of the republic of letters, a *ſmatterer* and a *ſimple fellow*. See WINWOOD's *Memorials*, vol. iii. p. 459.

[g] See ANTON. WOOD, *Athenæ Oxonienſ.* tom. i. p. 583.—NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. ii. ch. iv. p. 242.—CLARENDON's *Hiſtory of the Rebellion*, vol. i.

to confirm the king in the principles of Calviniſm, to which he himſelf was thoroughly attached. But ſcarcely had the Britiſh divines returned from the ſynod of *Dort*, and given an account of the laws that had been enacted, and the doctrines that had been eſtabliſhed by that famous aſſembly, than the king, together with the greateſt part of the epiſcopal clergy, diſcovered, in the ſtrongeſt terms, their diſlike of theſe proceedings, and judged the ſentiments of ARMINIUS, relating to the divine decrees, preferable to thoſe of GOMARUS and CALVIN [h]. This ſudden and unexpected change in the theological opinions of the court and clergy, was certainly owing to a variety of reaſons, as will appear evident to thoſe who have any acquaintance with the ſpirit and tranſactions of theſe times. The principal one, if we are not deceived, muſt be ſought in the plans of a further reformation of the church of *England*, that were propoſed by ſeveral eminent eccleſiaſtics, whoſe intention was to bring it to as near a reſemblance as was poſſible of the primitive church. And every one knows, that the peculiar doctrines to which the victory was aſſigned by the ſynod of *Dort*, were abſolutely unknown in the firſt ages of the Chriſtian church [i]. Be that

---

[h] See HEYLIN's *Hiſtory of the Five Articles.*—NEAL, ibid. vol. ii. ch. ii. p. 117. This latter author tells us, that the following verſes were made in *England*, with a deſign to pour contempt on the ſynod of *Dort*, and to turn its proceedings into ridicule:

Dordrechti Synodus, Nodus; Chorus Integer, Æger;
Conventus, Ventus: Seſſio, Stramen, Amen * !

With reſpect to JAMES, thoſe who are deſirous of forming a juſt idea of the character, proceedings, and theological fickleneſs and inconſtancy of that monarch, muſt peruſe the writers of Engliſh hiſtory, more eſpecially LARREY and RAPIN THOYRAS. The greateſt part of theſe writers tell us, that, towards the latter end of his days, JAMES, after having deſerted from the Calviniſts to the Arminians, began to diſcover a ſingular propenſity towards Popery; and they affirm poſitively, that he entertained the moſt ardent deſire of bringing about a union between the church of *England* and the church of *Rome*. In this, however, theſe writers ſeem to have gone too far; for though many of the proceedings of this injudicious prince deſerve juſtly the ſharpeſt cenſure, yet it is both raſh and unjuſt to accuſe him of a deſign to introduce Popery into *England*.

☞ * It would be a difficult, nay, an unſurmountable taſk, to juſtify all the proceedings of the ſynod of *Dort*; and it were much to be wiſhed, that they had been more conformable to the ſpirit of Chriſtian charity, than the repreſentations of hiſtory, impartially weighed, ſhew them to have been. We are not, however, to conclude, from the inſipid monkiſh lines here quoted by Dr. MOSHEIM, that the tranſactions and deciſions of that ſynod were univerſally condemned or deſpiſed in *England*. It had its partiſans in the eſtabliſhed church, as well as among the Puritans; and its deciſions, in point of doctrine, were looked upon by many, and not without reaſon, as agreeable to the tenour of the *Book of Articles eſtabliſhed by law in the Church of* England.

It is not to be believed, that a prince, who aſpired after arbitrary power and uncontrouled dominion, could ever have entertained a thought of ſubmitting to the yoke of the Roman pontif †. The truth of the matter ſeems to be this, that, towards the latter end of his reign, JAMES began to have leſs averſion to the doctrines and rites of the Romiſh church, and permitted certain religious obſervances, that were conformable to the ſpirit of that church, to be uſed in *England*. This conduct was founded upon a manner of reaſoning, which he had learned from ſeveral biſhops of his time, (*viz.*) That the primitive church is the model which all Chriſtian churches ought to imitate in doctrine and worſhip; that, in proportion as any church approaches to this primitive ſtandard of truth and purity, it muſt become proportionably pure and perfect; and that the Romiſh church retained more of the *ſpirit* and *manner* of the primitive church than the Puritan or Calviniſt churches. ☞ Of theſe three propoſitions, the two firſt are undoubtedly true, and the laſt is evidently and demonſtrably falſe. Beſides, this makes nothing to the argument; for as JAMES had a manifeſt averſion to the Puritans, it could, in his eyes, be no very great recommendation of the Romiſh church, that it ſurpaſſed that of the Puritans in doctrine and diſcipline.

☞ [i] Dr. MOSHEIM has annexed the following note to this paſſage: "Perhaps the king entered into theſe eccleſiaſtical "proceedings with the more readineſs, when he reflected on "the civil commotions and tumults that an attachment to "the *Preſbyterian* religion had occaſioned in *Scotland*. There

† This remark is confuted by fact, obſervation, and the perpetual contradictions that are obſervable in the conduct of men; beſides, ſee the note [i].

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART II.

that as it may, this change was fatal to the intereſts of the *Puritans*; for, the king being indiſpoſed to the opinions and inſtitutions of Calviniſm, the Puritans were left without defence, and expoſed anew to the animoſity and hatred of their adverſaries, which had been, for ſome time, ſuſpended; but now broke out with redoubled vehemence, and at length kindled a religious war, whoſe conſequences were deplorable beyond expreſſion. In the year 1625, died JAMES I., the bittereſt enemy of the doctrine and diſcipline of the Puritans, to which he had been in his youth moſt warmly attached; the moſt inflexible and ardent patron of the Arminians, in whoſe ruin and condemnation in *Holland* he had been ſingularly inſtrumental; and the moſt zealous defender of epiſcopal go-

---

" are alſo ſome circumſtances that intimate plainly enough, " that JAMES, before his acceſſion to the crown of *England*, " was very far from having an averſion to Popery." Thus far the note of our author, and whoever looks into the *Hiſtorical View of the Negociations between the Courts of* England, France, *and* Bruſſels, *from the year* 1592 *to* 1617, *extracted from the MSS. State Papers of Sir* THOMAS EDMONDES *and* ANTHONY BACON, *Eſq*; and publiſhed in the year 1749, by the learned and judicious Dr. BIRCH, will be perſuaded, that, towards the year 1595, this fickle and unſteady prince had really formed a deſign to embrace the faith of *Rome*. See, in the curious collection now mentioned, the *Poſtſcript* of a letter from Sir THOMAS EDMONDES to the Lord High Treaſurer, dated the 20th of *December* 1595. We learn alſo, from the *Memoirs* of Sir RALPH WINWOOD, that, in the year 1596, JAMES ſent Mr. OGILBY, a Scots baron, into *Spain*, to aſſure his Catholic Majeſty, that he was then ready and reſolved to embrace Popery, and to propoſe an alliance with that king and the Pope againſt the Queen of *England*. See *State Tracts*, vol. i. p. 1. See alſo an extract of a letter from TOBIE MATTHEW, D. D. dean of *Durham*, to the Lord Treaſurer BURLEIGH, containing an information of Scotch affairs, in STRYPE's *Annals*, vol. iv. p. 201. Above all, ſee HARRIS's *Hiſtorical and Critical Account of the Life and Writings of* JAMES I., p. 29. note (N). This laſt writer may be added to LARREY and RAPIN, who have expoſed the pliability and inconſiſtency of this ſelf-ſufficient monarch.

vernment, againſt which he had more than once expreſſed himſelf in the ſtrongeſt terms. He left the conſtitution of *England*, both eccleſiaſtical and civil, in a very unſettled and fluctuating ſtate, languiſhing under inteſtine diſorders of various kinds.

The ſtate of the church of *England* under Charles I.

XX. His ſon and ſucceſſor CHARLES I., who had imbibed his political and religious principles, had nothing ſo much at heart as to bring to perfection what his father had left unfiniſhed. All the exertions of his zeal, and the whole tenour of his adminiſtration, were directed towards the three following objects: "The extending the "royal prerogative and raiſing the power of the "crown above the authority of the law—the re"duction of all the churches in *Great Britain* and "*Ireland* under the juriſdiction of biſhops, whoſe "government he looked upon as of divine inſti"tution, and alſo as the moſt adapted to guard "the privileges and majeſty of the throne—and, "laſtly, the ſuppreſſion of the opinions and inſti"tutions that were peculiar to Calviniſm, and "the modelling of the doctrine, diſcipline, ce"remonies, and policy of the church of *England*, "after the ſpirit and conſtitution of the primi"tive church." The perſon whom the king chiefly intruſted with the execution of this arduous plan, was WILLIAM LAUD, biſhop of *London*, who was afterwards raiſed, in the year 1633, to the ſee of *Canterbury*, and exhibited, in theſe high ſtations, a mixed character, compoſed of great qualities and great defects. The voice of juſtice muſt celebrate his erudition, his fortitude, his ingenuity, his zeal for the ſciences, and his munificence and liberality to men of letters; and, at the ſame time, even charity muſt acknowledge with regret, his inexcuſable imprudence, his exceſſive ſuperſtition, his rigid attachment to the ſentiments, rites, and inſtitutions of the ancient church,

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART II.

church, which made him behold the Puritans and Calviniſts with horror [k]; and that violent ſpirit of animoſity and perſecution, that diſcovered itſelf in the whole courſe of his eccleſiaſtical adminiſtration [l]. This haughty prelate executed the plans of his royal maſter, and fulfilled the views of his own ambition, without uſing thoſe mild and moderate methods, that prudence employs to make unpopular ſchemes go down. He carried things with a high hand; when he found the laws oppoſing his views, he treated them with contempt, and violated them without heſitation; he loaded the Puritans with injuries and vexations, and aimed at nothing leſs than their total extinction; he rejected the Calviniſtical doctrine of Predeſtination publicly in the year 1625; and, notwithſtanding the oppoſition and remonſtrances of ABBOT, ſubſtituted the Arminian ſyſtem in its place [m]; he revived many religious rites and ceremonies,

---

[k] See ANT. WOOD, *Athenæ Oxonienſ.* tom. ii. p. 55.—HEYLIN's *Cyprianus*, or the *Hiſtory of the Life and Death of* WILLIAM LAUD, publiſhed at *London* in 1668.—CLARENDON's *Hiſtory*, vol. i.

[l] "Sincere he undoubtedly was (ſays Mr. HUME), and, "however miſguided, actuated by religious principles in all his "purſuits; and it is to be regretted, that a man of ſuch ſpirit, "who conducted his enterprizes with ſuch warmth and induſtry, "had not entertained more enlarged views, and embraced prin-"ciples more favourable to the general happineſs of human ſo-"ciety."

[m] See MICH. LE VASSOR, *Hiſt. de* LOUIS XIII. tom. v. p. 262.

☞ This expreſſion may lead the uninformed reader into a miſtake, and make him imagine that LAUD had cauſed the Calviniſtical doctrine of the xxxix Articles to be abrogated, and the tenets of ARMINIUS to be ſubſtituted in their place. It may therefore be proper to ſet this matter in a clearer light. In the year 1625, LAUD wrote a ſmall treatiſe to prove the orthodoxy of the Arminian doctrines; and, by his credit with the duke of BUCKINGHAM, had Arminian and Anti-puritanical chaplains placed about the king. This ſtep increaſed the debates between the Calviniſtical and Arminian doctors, and produced ceremonies, which, though ſtamped with the ſanction of antiquity, were nevertheleſs marked with

---

produced the warmeſt animoſities and diſſenſions. To calm theſe, the king iſſued out a proclamation, dated the 14th of January 1626, the literal tenor of which was, in truth, more favourable to the Calviniſts than to the Arminians, though, by the manner in which it was interpreted and executed by Laud, it was turned to the advantage of the latter. In this proclamation it was ſaid expreſsly, "that his majeſty would admit of no innovations in the *doctrine*, diſcipline, or government of the church;" (N. B. *The doctrine of the church previouſly to this, was Calviniſtical,*) "and therefore charges all his ſubjects, and eſpecially the clergy, not to publiſh or maintain in preaching or writing, any *new inventions* or *opinions*, contrary to the ſaid doctrine and diſcipline eſtabliſhed by law, &c." It was certainly a very ſingular inſtance of Laud's indecent partiality, that this proclamation was employed to ſuppreſs the books that were expreſsly written in the defence of the xxxix Articles, while the writings of the Arminians, who certainly oppoſed theſe articles, were publicly licenſed. I don't here enter into the merits of the cauſe; I only ſpeak of the tenor of the Proclamation, and the manner of its execution.

This manner of proceeding ſhewed how difficult and arduous a thing it is to change ſyſtems of doctrine eſtabliſhed by law, ſince neither Charles, who was by no means diffident of his authority, nor Laud, who was far from being timorous in the uſe and abuſe of it, attempted to reform articles of faith, that ſtood in direct oppoſition to the Arminian doctrines, which they were now promoting by the warmeſt encouragements, and which were daily gaining ground under their protection. Inſtead of reforming the xxxix Articles, which ſtep would have met with great oppoſition from the houſe of commons, and from a conſiderable part of the clergy and laity, who were ſtill warmly attached to Calviniſm, Laud adviſed the king to have theſe articles reprinted, with an ambiguous *declaration* prefixed to them, which might tend to ſilence or diſcourage the reigning controverſies between the Calviniſts and Arminians, and thus ſecure to the latter an unmoleſted ſtate, in which they would daily find their power growing under the countenance and protection of the court. This *declaration*, which, in moſt editions of the Common-Prayer, is ſtill to be found at the head of the articles, is a moſt curious piece of political theology; and had it not borne hard upon the right of private judgment, and been evidently deſigned to favour one party, though it carried the aſpect of a perfect neutrality, it might have been looked with the turpitude of ſuperſtition, and had been juſtly abrogated on that account; he forced biſhops

---

looked upon as a wiſe and provident meaſure to ſecure the tranquillity of the church. For, in the tenor of this *declaration*, preciſion was ſacrificed to prudence and ambiguity, nay, even contradictions were preferred before conſiſtent, clear, and poſitive deciſions, that might have fomented diſſenſions and diſcord. The declaration ſeemed to favour the Calviniſts, ſince it prohibited the *affixing any new ſenſe to any article*; it alſo favoured in effect the Arminians, as it ordered all *curious ſearch* about the conteſted points *to be laid aſide, and theſe diſputes to be ſhut up in God's promiſes, as they are generally ſet forth to us in holy ſcriptures, and the general meaning of the articles of the church of England according to them.* But what was ſingularly prepoſterous in this Declaration was, its being deſigned to favour the Arminians, and yet prohibiting expreſsly any perſon, either in their ſermons or writings, *to put his own ſenſe or comment to be the meaning of the article*, and ordering them, on the contrary, *to take* each *article in its literal and grammatical ſenſe, and to ſubmit to it in the full and plain meaning thereof*; for certainly if the 17th article has a plain, literal, and grammatical meaning, it is a meaning unfavourable to Arminianiſm; and biſhop BURNET was obliged afterwards to acknowledge, that without enlarging the ſenſe of the articles, the Arminians could not ſubſcribe them conſiſtently with their opinions, nor without violating the demands of common ingenuity. See BURNET's *remarks* on the examination of his expoſition, &c. p. 3.

This renders it probable, that the *declaration* now mentioned (in which we ſee no royal ſignature, no atteſtation of any officer of the crown, no date, in ſhort no mark to ſhew where, when, or by what authority it was iſſued out) was not compoſed in the reign of king CHARLES. Biſhop BURNET, indeed, was of opinion, that it was compoſed in that reign to ſupport the Arminians, who, when they were charged with departing from the true ſenſe of the articles, anſwered, "that they took the articles in their *literal* and *grammatical* "*ſenſe*, and therefore did not prevaricate." But this reaſoning does not appear concluſive to the acute and learned author of the *Confeſſional*. He thinks it more probable, that the declaration was compoſed, and firſt publiſhed, in the latter part of king JAMES's reign; for though, ſays he, there be no evidence that JAMES ever turned Arminian in principle, yet that was the party that ſtuck to him in his meaſures, and which it became neceſſary for him on that account to humour, and to render reſpectable in the eyes of the people by every expedient that ſhops upon the Scots nation, which were zealouſly attached to the diſcipline and eccleſiaſtical polity of *Geneva*, and had ſhewn, on all occaſions, the greateſt reluctance againſt an epiſcopal government; and, laſtly, he gave many and very plain intimations, that he looked upon the Romiſh church, with all its errors, as more pure, more holy, and preferable upon the whole, to thoſe Proteſtant churches that were not ſubject to the juriſdiction of biſhops. By theſe his unpopular ſentiments and violent meaſures, LAUD drew an odium on the king, on himſelf, and on the epiſcopal order in general. Hence, in the year 1644, he was brought before the public tribunals of juſtice, declared guilty of high treaſon, and condemned to loſe his head on a ſcaffold; which ſentence was accordingly executed.

After the death of LAUD, the diſſenſions that had reigned for a long time between the king and parliament, grew ſtill more violent, and aroſe at length to ſo great a height, that they could not be extinguiſhed but by the blood of that excellent prince. The great council of the nation, heated by the violent ſuggeſtions of the *Puritans* and *Independents* [n], aboliſhed epiſcopal government; condemned and abrogated every thing in the eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment that was contrary to the doctrine, worſhip, and diſcipline of the church of *Geneva*; turned the vehemence of their

---

that might not bring any reflexion on his own conſiſtency. "And "whoever, *continues this author*, conſiders the quibbling and "equivocal terms in which this inſtrument is drawn, will, I am "perſuaded, obſerve the diſtreſs of a man divided between his "*principles* and his *intereſts*, that is, of a man exactly in the ſituation of king JAMES I., in the three laſt years of his reign." It is likely then, that this *declaration* was only republiſhed at the head of the articles, which were reprinted by the order of CHARLES I.

[n] The origin of this ſect has been already mentioned.

oppoſition againſt the king himſelf, and having brought him into their power by the fate of arms, accuſed him of treaſon againſt the majeſty of the nation; and, in the year 1648, while the eyes of *Europe* were fixed with aſtoniſhment on this ſtrange ſpectacle, cauſed his head to be ſtruck off on a public ſcaffold. Such are the calamities that flow from religious zeal without knowledge, from that enthuſiaſm and bigotry that inſpire a blind and immoderate attachment to the external uneſſential parts of religion, and to certain doctrines ill-underſtood! Theſe broils and tumults ſerved alſo unhappily to confirm the truth of an obſervation often made, that all religious ſects, while they are kept under and oppreſſed, are remarkable for inculcating the duties of moderation, forbearance, and charity towards thoſe who diſſent from them; but, as ſoon as the ſcenes of perſecution are removed, and they, in their turn, arrive at power and pre-eminence, they forget their own precepts and maxims, and leave both the recommendation and practice of charity to thoſe that groan under their yoke. Such, in reality, was the conduct and behaviour of the *Puritans* during their tranſitory exaltation; they ſhewed as little clemency and equity to the biſhops and other patrons of epiſcopacy, as they had received from them when the reins of government were in their hands [*o*].

The *Independents.*

XXI. The *Independents*, who have been juſt mentioned among the promoters of civil diſcord in *England*, are generally repreſented by the Britiſh writers in a much worſe light than the *Preſbyterians* or Calviniſts. They are commonly accuſed of various enormities, and are even charged with the crime of parricide, as having borne a principal part in the death of the king. But whoever will be at the pains of examining, with impartiality and attention, the writings of that ſect, and their confeſſion of faith, muſt ſoon perceive, that many crimes have been imputed to them without foundation, and will probably be induced to think, that the bold attempts of the civil *Independents* (*i. e.* of thoſe warm republicans who were the declared enemies of monarchy, and wanted to extend the liberty of the people beyond all bounds of wiſdom and prudence) have been unjuſtly laid to the charge of thoſe *Independents*, whoſe principles were merely of a religious kind [p]. The religious *Independents* derive their denomination from the following principle, which they held in common with the *Browniſts*,

---

[*o*] Beſides CLARENDON and the other writers of Engliſh hiſtory already mentioned, ſee NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. ii. and iii.

---

[p] The ſect of the *Independents* is of recent date, and ſtill ſubſiſts in *England*; there is, nevertheleſs, not one, either of the ancient or modern ſects of Chriſtians, that is leſs known, or has been more loaded with groundleſs aſperſions and reproaches. The moſt eminent Engliſh writers, not only among the patrons of epiſcopacy, but even among thoſe very *Preſbyterians* with whom they are now united, have thrown out againſt them the bittereſt accuſations and the ſevereſt invectives that the warmeſt indignation could invent. They have not only been repreſented as delirious, mad, fanatical, illiterate, factious, and ignorant both of natural and revealed religion, but alſo as abandoned to all kinds of wickedneſs and ſedition, and as the only authors of the odious parricide committed on the perſon of CHARLES I. *. And as the authors who have given theſe repreſentations, are conſidered by foreigners as the beſt and moſt authentic relaters of the tranſactions that have paſſed in their own country, and are therefore followed as the ſureſt guides, the *Independents* appear, almoſt every where, under the moſt unfavourable aſpect. It muſt indeed be candidly acknowledged, that as every claſs and order of men conſiſts of perſons of very different characters and qualities, ſo alſo

* DURELL (whom nevertheleſs LEWIS DE MOULIN, the moſt zealous defender of the *Independents*, commends on account of his ingenuity and candour) in his *Hiſtoria Rituum Sanctæ Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ*, cap. i. p. 4. expreſſes himſelf thus: *Fateor, ſi atrocis illius Tragœdiæ tot actus fuerint, quot ludicrarum eſſe ſolent. poſtremum ſere Independentium fuiſſe—Adeo ut non acute magis quàm vere, dixerit* L'ESTRANGIUS *Noſter: Regem primo à Preſbyterianis interemtum*, CAROLUM *deinde ab Independentibus interfectum.*

---

alſo the ſect of *Independents* has been diſhonoured by ſeveral turbulent, factious, profligate, and flagitious members. But, if it is a conſtant maxim with the wiſe and prudent, not to judge of the ſpirit and principles of a ſect from the actions or expreſſions of a handful of its members, but from the manners, cuſtoms, opinions, and behaviour of the generality of thoſe who compoſe it, from the writings and diſcourſes of its learned men, and from its public and avowed forms of doctrine and confeſſions of faith; then, I make no doubt but that, by this rule of eſtimating matters, the *Independents* will appear to have been unjuſtly loaded with ſo many accuſations and reproaches.

We ſhall take no notice of the invidious and ſevere animadverſions that have been made upon this religious Community by CLARENDON, ECHARD, PARKER, and ſo many other writers. To ſet this whole matter in the cleareſt and moſt impartial light, we ſhall confine ourſelves to the account of the *Independents* given by a writer, juſtly celebrated by the Engliſh themſelves, and who, though a foreigner, is generally ſuppoſed to have had an accurate knowledge of the Britiſh nation, its hiſtory, its parties, its ſects, and revolutions. This writer is RAPIN-THOYRAS, (who in the twenty-firſt book of his *Hiſtory of England*, vol. ii. p. 514. edit. folio) repreſents the *Independents* under ſuch horrid colours, that, were his portrait juſt, they would not deſerve to enjoy the light of the ſun, or to breathe the free air of Britain, much leſs to be treated with indulgence and eſteem by thoſe who have the cauſe of virtue at heart. Let us now examine the account, which this illuſtrious hiſtorian gives of this ſect. He declares, in the firſt place, that, notwithſtanding all the pains he had taken to trace out the true origin of it, his inquiries had been entirely fruitleſs; his words are, as tranſlated by Mr. TINDAL; *After all my pains, I have not been able to diſcover, preciſely, the firſt riſe of the Independent ſect, or faction.* It is very ſurpriſing to hear a man of learning, who had employed ſeventeen years in compoſing the Hiſtory of *England*, and had admittance to ſo many rich and famous libraries, expreſs his ignorance of a matter, about which it was ſo eaſy to acquire ample information. Had he only looked into the work of the learned HORNBECK, entitled, *Summa Controverſiarum*, lib. x. p. 775. he would have found, in a moment, what he had been ſo long and ſo laboriouſly ſeeking in vain. RAPIN proceeds to the doctrines and opinions of the *Independents*, and begins here, by a general declaration of their tendency to throw the nation into

diſorder

Browniſts, that every Chriſtian congregation ought to be governed by its own laws, without depending

---

diſorder and combuſtion; his words are, *Thus much is certain, their principles were very proper to put the kingdom in a flame; and this they did effectually.* What truth there is in this aſſertion, will be ſeen by what follows. Their ſentiments concerning government were, if we are to believe this writer, of the moſt pernicious kind; ſince, according to him, they wanted to overturn the monarchy, and to eſtabliſh a democracy in its place; his words are, *With regard to the ſtate, they abhorred monarchy, and approved only a republican government.* I will not pretend to deny, that there were among the *Independents* ſeveral perſons, that were no friends to a kingly government; perſons of this kind were to be found among the *Preſbyterians*, *Anabaptiſts*, and all the other religious ſects and communities that flouriſhed in *England* during this tumultuous period; but I want to ſee it proved, in an evident and ſatisfactory manner, that theſe republican principles were embraced by all the *Independents*, and formed one of the diſtinguiſhing characteriſtics of that ſect. There is, at leaſt, no ſuch thing to be found in their public writings. They declared, on the contrary, in a public memorial drawn up by them in the year 1647, that, as magiſtracy in general is the ordinance of God, *they do not diſapprove of any form of civil government, but do freely acknowledge, that a kingly government, bounded by juſt and wholeſome laws, is both allowed by God; and alſo a good accommodation unto men.* I omit the mention of ſeveral other circumſtances, which unite to prove that the *Independents* were far from looking with abhorrence on a monarchical government.

Their ſentiments of religion, according to Rapin's account, were higly abſurd, ſince he repreſents their principles as entirely oppoſite to thoſe of all other religious communities: *As to religion,* ſays he, *their principles were contrary to thoſe of all the reſt of the world.* With reſpect to this accuſation, it may be proper to obſerve, that there are extant two *Confeſſions of Faith*, one of the Engliſh *Independents* in *Holland*, and another drawn up by the principal members of that community in *England*. The former was compoſed by John Robinson, the founder of the ſect, and was publiſhed at *Leyden* in 4to, in the year 1619, under the following title: *Apologia pro exulibus Anglis, qui Browniſtæ vulgo appellantur*; the latter appeared at *London*, for the firſt time, in the year 1658, and was thus entitled: *A Declaration of the Faith and Order owned and practiſed in the Congregational Churches in* England, *agreed upon, and conſented unto, by the Elders and Meſſengers, in their meeting at the* depending on the juriſdiction of biſhops, or being ſubject to the authority of ſynods, preſbyteries,

---

the Savoy, *October* 12, 1658. Hornbeck gave, in the year 1659, a Latin tranſlation of this *Declaration*, and ſubjoined it to his *Epiſtolæ ad* Duræum *de Independentiſmo*. It appears evidently from theſe two public and authentic pieces, not to mention other writings of the *Independents*, that they differed from the *Preſbyterians* or Calviniſts in no ſingle point of any conſequence, except that of eccleſiaſtical government. To put this matter beyond all doubt, we have only to attend to the following paſſage in Robinson's *Apology for the Engliſh Exiles*, p. 7. 11. where that founder of the ſect of the *Independents* expreſſes his own private ſentiments, and thoſe of his community, in the plaineſt manner: *Profitemur coram Deo et hominibus, adeo nobis convenire cum Eccleſiis Reformatis, Belgicis in re religionis, ut omnibus et ſingulis earundem Eccleſiarum fidei articulis, prout habentur in Harmonia confeſſionum fidei, parati ſimus ſubſcribere.—Eccleſias Reformatis pro veris et genuinis habemus, cum iiſdem in ſacris Dei communionem profitemur, et, quantum in nobis eſt, colimus.* It appears evident from this declaration, that, inſtead of differing totally from all other Chriſtian ſocieties, it may rather be ſaid of the *Independents*, that they were perfectly agreed with by far the greateſt part of the Reformed churches. To ſhew, as he imagines, by a ſtriking example, the abſurdity of their religion and worſhip, our eminent hiſtorian tell us, that they not only reject all kind of eccleſiaſtical government, but morever allow all their members promiſcuouſly, and without exception, to perform in public the paſtoral functions, *i. e.* to preach, pray, and expound the Scriptures; his words are, *They were not only averſe to epiſcopacy and the eccleſiaſtical hierarchy* (this charge is true, but it may equally be brought againſt the Preſbyterians, Browniſts, Anabaptiſts, and all the various ſects of Non-conformiſts), *but they would not ſo much as endure ordinary miniſters in the church. They maintained, that every man might pray in public, exhort his brethren, and interpret the Scriptures according to the talents God had endowed him with.—So with them every one preached, prayed, admoniſhed, interpreted the holy Scriptures, without any other call than what he himſelf drew from his zeal and ſuppoſed gifts, and without any other authority than the approbation of his auditors.* This whole charge is evidently falſe and groundleſs. The *Independents* have, and always have had, *fixed* and *regular* miniſters, *approved of* by their people; nor do they allow to teach in public every perſon, who thinks himſelf qualified for that important office. The celebrated hiſtorian has here confounded the *Independents* with the *Browniſts*, who, as is well teries, or any eccleſiaſtical aſſembly compoſed of the deputies from different churches [q]. It is in

---

known, permitted all to pray and preach in public without diſtinction. We ſhall not enlarge upon the other miſtakes he has fallen into on this ſubject; but only obſerve, that if ſo eminent a writer, and one ſo well acquainted with the Engliſh nation, has pronounced ſuch an unjuſt ſentence againſt this ſect, we may the more eaſily excuſe an inferior ſet of authors, who have loaded them with groundleſs accuſations.

It will however be alleged, that, whatever may have been the religious ſentiments and diſcipline of the *Independents*, innumerable teſtimonies concur in proving, that they were chargeable with the death of Charles I.; and many will conſider this ſingle circumſtance as a ſufficient demonſtration of the impiety and depravity of the whole ſect. I am well aware, indeed, that many of the moſt eminent and reſpectable Engliſh writers have given the *Independents* the denomination of *Regicides*; and, if by the term *Independents* they mean thoſe licentious republicans, whoſe diſlike of a monarchical form of government carried them the moſt pernicious and extravagant lengths, I grant that this denomination is well applied. But if by the term, *Independents*, we are to underſtand a *religious* ſect, the anceſtors of thoſe who ſtill bear the ſame title in *England*, it appears very queſtionable to me, whether the unhappy fate of the worthy prince abovementioned ought to be imputed entirely to that ſet of men. They who affirm that the *Independents* were the only authors of the death of King Charles, muſt mean one of theſe two things, either that the *Regicides* were animated and ſet on by the ſeditious doctrines of that ſect, and the violent ſuggeſtions of its members, or that all who were concerned in this atrocious deed were themſelves *Independents*, zealouſly attached to the religious community now under conſideration. Now it may be proved, with the cleareſt evidence, that neither of theſe was the caſe. There is nothing in the doctrines of this ſect, ſo far as they are known to me, that ſeems in the leaſt adapted to excite men to ſuch a horrid deed; nor does it appear from the hiſtory of theſe times, that the *Independents* were a whit more exaſperated againſt Charles, than were the *Preſbyterians*. And as to the latter ſuppoſition, it is far from being true, that all thoſe who were concerned in bringing this unfortunate prince to the ſcaffold were *Independents*; ſince we learn from the beſt Engliſh writers, and from the public declarations of Charles II., that this violent faction was compoſed of perſons of different ſects. That there were *Independents* among them, may be eaſily conceived. After all; this matter will be beſt unravelled by the Engliſh writers, in this their notion of eccleſiaſtical government, that the difference between them and the *Preſbyterians*

---

writers, who know beſt in what ſenſe the term *Independents* is uſed, when it is applied to thoſe who brought CHARLES I. to the block *.

On inquiring, with particular attention, into the cauſes of that *odium* that has been caſt upon the *Independents*, and of the heavy accuſations and ſevere invectives with which they have been loaded, I was more peculiarly ſtruck with the three following conſiderations, which will perhaps furniſh a ſatisfactory account of this matter. In the *firſt place*, the denomination of *Independents* is ambiguous, and is not peculiar to any one diſtinct order of men. For, not to enumerate the other notions that have been annexed to this term, it is ſufficient to obſerve, that it is uſed ſometimes by the Engliſh writers to denote thoſe who aim at the eſtabliſhment of a purely *democratical* or popular government, in which the body of the people is clothed with the ſupreme dominion. Such a faction there was in *England*, compoſed, in a great meaſure, of perſons of an enthuſiaſtical character and complexion; and to it, no doubt, we are to aſcribe thoſe ſcenes of ſedition and miſery,

☞ * Dr. MOSHEIM's defence of the *Independents* is certainly ſpecious; but he has not ſufficiently diſtinguiſhed the times; and he has perhaps, in defending them, ſtrained too far that equitable principle, that we muſt not impute to a ſect any principles that are not contained in, or deducible from, their religious ſyſtem. This maxim does not entirely anſwer here the purpoſe for which it is applied. The religious *ſyſtem* of a ſect may be in itſelf pacific and innocent, while, at the ſame time, certain incidental circumſtances, or certain aſſociations of ideas, may render that ſect more turbulent and reſtleſs than others, or at leaſt involve it in political factions and broils. Such perhaps was the caſe of the *Independents* at certain periods of time, and more eſpecially at the period now under conſideration. When we conſider their religious form of government, we ſhall ſee evidently, that a principle of analogy (which influences the ſentiments and imaginations of men much more than is generally ſuppoſed) muſt naturally have led the greateſt part of them to republican notions of civil government; and it is further to be obſerved, that from a republican government, they muſt have expected much more protection and favour than from a kingly one. When theſe two things are conſidered, together with their ſituation under the reign of CHARLES I. when the government was unhinged, when things were in confuſion, when the minds of men were ſuſpended upon the iſſue of the national troubles, and when the eager ſpirit of party, nouriſhed by hope, made each faction expect that the chaos would end in ſome ſettled ſyſtem, favourable to their reſpective views, ſentiments, and paſſions; this will engage us to think, that the *Independents*, at that time, may have been much more tumultuous and republican than the ſect that bears that denomination in our times. The reader, that would form juſt ideas of the matter of fact, muſt examine the relations given by the writers of both parties. See particularly CLARENDON's *Hiſtory of his own Life*.—NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. iii. p. 547. &c. —HUME's *Hiſtory of England*, vol. v. Edit. in Quarto.—BURNET's *Hiſtory of his own Times*, vol. i. p. 46, 47.

terians principally conſiſts; for their religious doctrines, except in ſome points of very little moment,

---

whoſe effects are ſtill lamented with juſtice. The violence and folly that diſhonoured the proceedings of this tumultuous faction have been, if I am not miſtaken, too raſhly imputed to the *religious Independents* now under conſideration, who, with all their defects, were a much better ſet of men than the perſons now mentioned. It may be obſerved further, *ſecondly*, that almoſt all the religious ſects, which divided the Engliſh nation in the reign of CHARLES I., and more eſpecially under the adminiſtration of CROMWELL, aſſumed the denomination of *Independents*, in order to ſkreen themſelves from the reproaches of the public, and to ſhare a part of that popular eſteem that the *true* and *genuine Independents* had acquired, on account of the regularity of their lives and the ſanctity of their manners. This is confirmed, among other teſtimonies, by the following paſſage of a letter from TOLAND to LE CLERC: *Au commencement tous les ſectaires ſe diſoient* INDEPENDANS, *parce que ces derniers etoient fort honorés du peuple à cauſe de leur pieté.* See LE CLERC's *Biblioth. Univerſ. et Hiſtor.* tom. xxiii. p. ii. p. 506. As this title was of a very extenſive ſignification, and of great latitude, it might thus eaſily happen, that all the enormities of the various ſects who ſheltered themſelves under it, and ſeveral of whom were but of ſhort duration, might unluckily be laid to the charge of the true *Independents*. But it muſt be particularly remarked, in the *third place*, that the uſurper CROMWELL preferred the *Independents* before all other religious communities. He looked, with an equal eye of ſuſpicion and fear, upon the *Preſbyterian ſynods* and the *Epiſcopal viſitations*; every thing that looked like an extenſive authority, whether it was of a civil or religious nature, excited uneaſy apprehenſions in the breaſt of the tyrant; but in the limited and ſimple form of eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, that was adopted by the *Independents*, he ſaw nothing that was adapted to alarm his fears. This circumſtance was ſufficient to render the *Independents* odious in the eyes of many, who would be naturally diſpoſed to extend their abhorrence of CROMWELL to thoſe who were the objects of his favour and protection.

[q] The *Independents* were undoubtedly ſo called from their maintaining that all Chriſtian congregations were ſo many *Independent* religious ſocieties, that had a right to be governed by their own laws, without being ſubject to any further or foreign juriſdiction. ROBINSON, the founder of the ſect, makes expreſs uſe of this term in explaining his doctrine relating to eccleſiaſtical government: *Cœtum quemlibet particularem* (ſays he,

ment, are almoſt entirely the ſame with thoſe that are adopted by the church of *Geneva*. The founder of this ſect was JOHN ROBINSON, a man who had much of the ſolemn piety of the times, and was maſter of a congregation of *Browniſts*, that had ſettled at *Leyden*. This well-meaning man, perceiving the defects that reigned in the diſcipline of BROWN, and in the ſpirit and temper of his followers, employed his zeal and diligence in correcting them, and in modelling anew the ſociety, in ſuch a manner as to render it leſs odious to his adverſaries, and leſs liable to the juſt cen-

---

he, in his *Apologia*, cap. v. p. 22.) *eſſe totam, integram, et perfectam eccleſiam ex ſuis partibus conſtantem, immediatè et* INDEPENDENTER *(quoad alias eccleſias) ſub ipſo Chriſto.* It may poſſibly have been from this very paſſage that the title of *Independents* was originally derived. The diſciples of ROBINSON did not reject it; nor indeed is there any thing ſhocking in the title, when it is underſtood in a manner conformable to the ſentiments of thoſe to whom it is applied. It was certainly utterly unknown in *England* before the year 1640; at leaſt it is not once mentioned in the eccleſiaſtical canons and conſtitutions that were drawn up, during that year, in the ſynods or viſitations held by the archbiſhops of *Canterbury*, *York*, and other prelates, in which canons all the various ſects that then ſubſiſted in *England* are particularly mentioned. See WILKIN's *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ*, vol. iv. cap. v. p. 548. where are the *conſtitutions and canons eccleſiaſtical, treated upon by the archbiſhops of* Canterbury *and* York, *and the reſt of the biſhops and clergy, in their ſeveral ſynods.* An. MDCXL. It is true, that not long after this period, and more particularly from the year 1642, we find this denomination very frequently in the Engliſh *Annals*. The Engliſh *Independents* were ſo far from being diſpleaſed with it, that they aſſumed it publicly in a piece they publiſhed in their own defence at *London*, in the year 1644, under the following title: *Apologetical Narration of the Independents*. But when in proceſs of time a great variety of ſects, as has been already obſerved, ſheltered themſelves under the cover of this extenſive denomination, and even ſeditious ſubjects, that aimed at nothing leſs than the death of their ſovereign and the deſtruction of the government, employed it as a maſk to hide their deformity, then the true and genuine *Independents* renounced this title, and ſubſtituted another leſs odious in its place, calling themſelves *Congregational Brethren*, and their religious aſſemblies *Congregational Churches*.

ſure of thoſe true Chriſtians, who looked upon charity as the end of the commandment. The *Independents*, accordingly, were much more commendable than the *Browniſts* in two reſpects. They ſurpaſſed them both in the moderation of their ſentiments, and the order of their diſcipline. They did not, like BROWN, pour forth bitter and uncharitable invectives againſt the churches that were governed by rules entirely different from theirs, nor pronounce them, on that account, unworthy of the Chriſtian name. On the contrary, though they conſidered their own form of eccleſiaſtical government as of divine inſtitution, and as originally introduced by the authority of the apoſtles, nay, by the apoſtles themſelves, yet they had candour and charity enough to acknowledge, that true religion and ſolid piety might flouriſh in thoſe communities, which were under the juriſdiction of biſhops, or the government of ſynods and preſbyteries. They were alſo much more attentive than the *Browniſts* in keeping on foot a regular miniſtry in their communities; for while the latter allowed promiſcuouſly all ranks and orders of men to teach in public, and to perform the other paſtoral functions, the *Independents* had, and ſtill have, a certain number of miniſters, choſen reſpectively by the congregations where they are fixed; nor is any perſon among them permitted to ſpeak in public, before he has ſubmitted to a proper examination of his capacity and talents, and been approved of by the heads of the congregation. This community, which was originally formed in *Holland*, in the year 1610, made at firſt but a very ſmall progreſs in *England* [qq]; it worked its way ſlowly, and in a clandeſtine manner; and its members concealed their principles from public view, to avoid the penal laws that had been enacted againſt *Non-conformiſts*. But during the reign of CHARLES I., when, amidſt the ſhocks of civil and religious diſcord, the authority of the biſhops and the cauſe of epiſcopacy began to decline, and more particularly about the year 1640, the *Independents* grew more courageous, and came forth with an air of reſolution and confidence, to public view. After this period, their affairs took a proſperous turn; and, in a little time, they became ſo conſiderable, both by their numbers and by the reputation they acquired, that they vied in point of pre-eminence and credit, not only with the biſhops, but alſo with the *Preſbyterians*, though at this time in the very zenith of their power. This rapid progreſs of the *Independents* was, no doubt, owing to a variety of cauſes; among which juſtice obliges us to reckon the learning of their teachers, and the regularity and ſanctity of their manners [r]. During the adminiſtration of CROMWELL, whoſe peculiar protection and patronage they enjoyed on more than one account, their credit aroſe to the greateſt height, and their influence and reputation were univerſal; but after the reſtoration of CHARLES II., their cauſe declined, and they fell back gradually into their primitive obſcurity. The ſect, indeed, ſtill ſubſiſted; but in ſuch a ſtate of dejection and weakneſs, as engaged them in the year 1691, under the reign of King WILLIAM, to enter into an aſſociation with the *Preſbyterians* reſiding in and about *London*, under certain heads of agreement that tended to the maintenance of their reſpective inſtitutions [s].

[qq] In the year 1616, Mr. JACOB, who had adopted the religious ſentiments of ROBINSON, ſet up the firſt *Independent* or *Congregational* church in *England*.

XXII.

---

[r] NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 107. 293. vol. viii. p. 141. 145. 276. 303. 437. 549. See alſo a German work, entitled, *Engliſche Reformations-Hiſtorie*, by ANTHONY WILLIAM BOHM, p. 794.

[s] From this time they were called *United Brethren*. The heads of agreement that formed and cemented this union are

The ſtate of the church of *England* under Cromwell.

XXII. While Oliver Cromwell held the reins of government in *Great Britain*, all ſects, even

---

to be found in the ſecond volume of Whiston's *Memoirs of his Life and Writings*, and they conſiſt in Nine Articles. The *Firſt* relates to *Churches* and *Church Members*, in which the United Miniſters, *Preſbyterians* and *Independents*, declare, among other things, *That each particular church had a right to chuſe their own officers; and being furniſhed with ſuch as are duly qualified and ordained according to the Goſpel rule, hath authority from Chriſt for exerciſing government, and enjoying all the ordinances of worſhip within itſelf—That, in the adminiſtration of church-power, it belongs to the paſtors and other elders of every particular church (if ſuch there be) to rule and govern; and to the brotherhood to conſent, according to the rule of the Goſpel.* In this both Preſbyterians and Independents depart from the primitive principles of their reſpective inſtitutions. Article II. relates to the *Miniſtry*, which they grant to have been inſtituted by Jesus Christ, *for the gathering, guiding, edifying, and governing of his church*; in this article it is further obſerved, *that miniſters ought to be endued with competent learning, ſound judgment, and ſolid piety*; that *none are to be ordained to the work of the miniſtry, but ſuch as are choſen and called thereunto by a particular church*; that, in ſuch a weighty matter, *it is ordinarily requiſite, that every ſuch church conſult and adviſe with the paſtors of neighbouring congregations*; and that *after ſuch advice the perſon thus conſulted about, being choſen by the brotherhood of that particular church, be duly ordained and ſet apart to his office over them.* Article III. relates to *Cenſures*, and preſcribes, firſt, the *admoniſhing*, and, if this prove ineffectual, the *excommunication* of offending and ſcandalous members to be performed by the paſtors, with the conſent of the brethren. Article IV. concerning the *Communion of Churches*, lays it down as a principle, that there is no ſubordination between particular churches; that they are all equal, and conſequently independent; that the paſtors, however, of theſe churches *ought to have frequent meetings together, that, by mutual advice, ſupport, encouragement, and brotherly intercourſe, they ſtrengthen the hearts and hands of each other in the ways of the Lord.* In Article V. which relates to *Deacons* and *Ruling Elders*, the United Brethren acknowledge, that *the office of a deacon is of divine appointment, and that it belongs to their office to receive, lay out, and diſtribute, the ſtock of the church to its proper uſes*; and as there are different ſentiments about the office of *Ruling Elders*, who labour not in word and doctrine, they agree, that this difference makes no breach among them. In Article VI. concerning *Occaſional Meetings of Miniſters, &c.* the brethren agree, that it is needful, in weighty and difficult even thoſe that diſhonoured true religion in the moſt ſhocking manner by their fanaticiſm or their ignorance, enjoyed a full and unbounded liberty of profeſſing publicly their reſpective doctrines. The *Epiſcopalians* alone were excepted from this toleration, and received the moſt ſevere and iniquitous treatment. The biſhops were deprived of their dignities and revenues, and felt the heavy hand of oppreſſion in a particular manner. But though the toleration extended to all other ſects and religious communities, yet the *Preſbyterians* and *Independents* were treated with peculiar marks of diſtinction and favour. CROMWELL, though attached to no one particular ſect, gave the latter extraordinary proofs of his good-will, and augmented their credit and authority, as this ſeemed the eaſieſt and leaſt exaſperating method of ſetting bounds to the ambition of the *Preſbyterians*, who aimed at a very high degree of eccleſiaſtical power [*t*]. It was during this period of religious

---

ficult caſes, that the miniſters of ſeveral churches meet together, *in order to be conſulted and adviſed with about ſuch matters*; and that particular churches *ought to have a reverential regard to their judgment ſo given, and not diſſent therefrom without apparent grounds from the word of God.* Article VII. which relates to the *Demeanor of the Brethren towards the Civil Magiſtrate*, preſcribes obedience to, and prayers for God's protection and bleſſing upon, their rulers. In Article VIII. which relates to a *Confeſſion of Faith*, the brethren eſteem it ſufficient, that a church acknowledge the Scriptures to be the word of God, the perfect and only rule of faith and practice, and *own either the doctrinal part of the articles of the church of* England, or the *Weſtminſter* Confeſſion and Catechiſms, drawn up by the *Preſbyterians*, or the Confeſſion of the *Congregational Brethren* (*i. e.* the *Independents*), to be agreeable to the ſaid rule. Article IX. which concerns the *duty and deportment of the Brethren towards thoſe that are not in communion with them*, inculcates charity and moderation. It appears from theſe articles, that the *Independents* were led, by a kind of neceſſity, to adopt, in many things, the ſentiments of the *Preſbyterians*, and to depart thus far from the original principles of their ſect.

☞[*t*] A little after CROMWELL's elevation, it was reſolved by the parliament, at the concluſion of a debate concerning public worſhip and church-government, that the *Preſbyterian* government religious anarchy, that the *Fifth-monarchy-men* aroſe, a ſet of wrong-headed and turbulent enthuſiaſts, who expected CHRIST's ſudden appearance upon earth to eſtabliſh a new kingdom; and, acting in conſequence of this illuſion, aimed at the ſubverſion of all human government, and were for turning all things into the moſt deplorable confuſion [*u*]. It was at this time alſo, that the *Quakers*, of whom we propoſe to give a more particular account [*w*], and the hot-headed *Anabaptiſts* [*x*], propagated, without reſtraint, their viſionary doctrines. It muſt likewiſe be obſerved, that the *Deiſts*, headed by SIDNEY, NEVILLE, MARTIN, and HARRINGTON, appeared with impunity, and promoted a kind of religion, which conſiſted in a few plain

---

ment ſhould be the eſtabliſhed government. The *Independents* were not, as yet, agreed upon any ſtandard of faith and diſcipline; and it was only a little before CROMWELL's death that they held a ſynod, by his permiſſion, in order to publiſh to the world an *uniform* account of their doctrine and principles.

[*u*] See BURNET's *Hiſtory of his own Times*, tom. i. p. 67.

[*w*] See in Vol. V. *The Hiſtory of the Quakers.*

☞ [*x*] We are not to imagine, by the term hot-headed (*furioſi*), that the *Anabaptiſts* reſembled the furious fanatics of that name that formerly excited ſuch dreadful tumults in *Germany*, and more eſpecially at *Munſter*. This was by no means the caſe; the Engliſh Anabaptiſts differed from their Proteſtant brethren about the *ſubject* and *mode* of baptiſm alone; confining the former to *grown Chriſtians*, and the latter to *immerſion* or dipping. They were divided into *Generals* and *Particulars*, from their different ſentiments upon the Arminian controverſy. The latter, who were ſo called from their belief of the doctrines of *Particular Election, Redemption*, &c. were ſtrict Calviniſts, who ſeparated from the *Independent* congregation at *Leyden*, in the year 1638. Their confeſſion was compoſed with a remarkable ſpirit of modeſty and charity. Their preachers were generally illiterate, and were eager in making proſelytes of all that would ſubmit to their *immerſion*, without a due regard to their religious principles or their moral characters. The writers of theſe times repreſent them as tinctured with a kind of enthuſiaſtic fury againſt all that oppoſed them. There were, nevertheleſs, among them ſome learned and pious perſons, who diſapproved highly of all violent and uncharitable proceedings.

precepts drawn from the dictates of natural reaſon [y].

The Engliſh Antinomians.

XXIII. Among the various religious factions that ſprung up in *England* during this period of confuſion and anarchy, we may reckon a certain ſect of *Preſbyterians*, who were called by their adverſaries *Antinomians*, or enemies of the law, and ſtill ſubſiſt even in our times. The *Antinomians* are a more rigid kind of Calviniſts, who pervert CALVIN's doctrine of abſolute decrees to the worſt purpoſes, by drawing from it concluſions highly detrimental to the intereſts of true religion and virtue. Such is the judgment that the other Preſbyterian communities form of this perverſe and extravagant ſect [z]. Several of the *Antinomians* (for they are not all preciſely of the ſame mind) look upon it as unneceſſary for Chriſtian miniſters to exhort their flock to a virtuous practice and a pious obedience to the divine law, "ſince they whom God has *elected* to ſalvation "by an eternal and immutable decree, will, by "the *irreſiſtible* impulſe of divine grace, be led "to the practice of piety and virtue; while thoſe "who are doomed by a divine decree to eternal puniſhments, will never be engaged, by "any exhortations or admonitions, how affecting "ſoever they may be, to a virtuous courſe; nor "have they it in their power to obey the divine "law, when the ſuccours of divine grace are withheld from them." From theſe principles they concluded, that the miniſters of the Goſpel diſcharged ſufficiently their paſtoral functions, when they inculcated the neceſſity of *faith in Chriſt*, and proclaimed the bleſſings of the new covenant to their

---

[y] NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. iv. p. 87.

[z] See TOLAND's Letter to LE CLERC, in the periodical work of the latter, entitled, *Bibliotheque Univerſelle et Hiſtorique*, tom. xxiii. p. 505.—As alſo HORNBECK, *Summa Controverſiarum*, p. 800. 812.

people,

people. Another, and a ſtill more hideous form of *Antinomianiſm*, is that which is exhibited in the opinions of other doctors of that ſect [a], who maintain, "That as the *elect* cannot fall from "grace, nor forfeit the divine favour, ſo it fol"lows, that the wicked actions they commit, "and the violations of the divine law with which "they are chargeable, are not *really ſinful*, nor "are to be conſidered as inſtances of their de"parting from the law of God; and that, con"ſequently, they have no occaſion either to con"feſs their ſins, or to break them off by repen"tance. Thus adultery, for example, in one of "the *elect*, though it appear *ſinful* in the ſight of "men, and be conſidered univerſally as an enor"mous violation of the divine law, yet is not a "*ſin* in the ſight of God, becauſe it is one of the "eſſential and diſtinctive characters of the elect, "that *they cannot do any thing which is either diſ*"*pleaſing to God, or prohibited by the law* [b]."

Latitudinarians.

XXIV. The public calamities, that flowed from theſe vehement and uncharitable diſputes about religion, afflicted all wiſe and good men, and engaged ſeveral, who were not leſs eminent

---

☞ [a] This ſecond *Antinomian* hypotheſis has certainly a ſtill more odious aſpect than the firſt; and it is therefore ſurpriſing that our author ſhould uſe, in the original, theſe terms: *Hi tantum ſtatuunt, Electos*, &c.

[b] There is an account of the other tenets of the *Antinomians*, and of the modern diſputes that were occaſioned by the publication of the Poſthumous Works of CRISP, a flaming doctor of that extravagant and pernicious ſect, given by PIERRE FRANCOIS LE COURAYER, in his *Examen des defauts Theologiques*, tom. ii. p. 198. BAXTER and TILLOTSON diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their zeal againſt the *Antinomians*; and they were alſo completely refuted by Dr. WILLIAMS, in his famons book, entitled, *Goſpel Truth ſtated and vindicated*, 8vo. ☞ I have been informed, ſince the firſt edition of this hiſtory was publiſhed, that the book, entitled, *Examen des defauts Theologiques*, which our author ſuppoſes to have been written by Dr. COURAYER, is the production of another pen.

for their piety than for their moderation and wiſdom, to ſeek after ſome method of uniting ſuch of the contending parties as were capable of liſtening to the dictates of charity and reaſon, or, at leaſt, of calming their animoſities, and perſuading them to mutual forbearance. Theſe pacific doctors offered themſelves as mediators between the more violent *Epiſcopalians* on the one hand, and the more rigid *Preſbyterians* and *Independents* on the other; and hoped that, when their differences were accommodated, the leſſer factions would fall of themſelves. The conteſts that reigned between the former turned partly on the forms of church-government and public worſhip, and partly on certain religious tenets, more eſpecially thoſe that were debated between the Arminians and Calviniſts. To leſſen the breach that kept theſe two great communities at ſuch a diſtance from each other, the arbitrators, already mentioned, endeavoured to draw them out of their narrow incloſures, to render their charity more extenſive, and widen the paths of ſalvation, which bigotry and party-rage had been labouring to render inacceſſible to many good Chriſtians. This noble and truly evangelical method of proceeding procured to its authors the denomination of *Latitudinarians* [c]. Their views, indeed, were generous and extenſive. They were zealouſly attached to the forms of eccleſiaſtical government and worſhip, that were eſtabliſhed in the church of *England*, and they recommended epiſcopacy with all the ſtrength and power of their eloquence; but they did not go ſo far as to look upon it as of *divine inſtitution*, or as abſolutely and indiſpenſably neceſſary to the conſtitution of a Chriſtian church; and hence they maintained, that thoſe who followed other forms of government and worſhip were not, on that account, to be excluded from their communion, or to forfeit the title of brethren. As to the doctrinal part of religion, they took the ſyſtem of the famous EPISCOPIUS for their model; and, like him, reduced the fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity, (*i. e.*) thoſe doctrines the belief of which is neceſſary to ſalvation, to a few points. By this manner of proceeding they ſhewed, that neither the *Epiſcopalians*, who, generally ſpeaking, embraced the ſentiments of the Arminians, nor the *Preſbyterians* and *Independents*, who as generally adopted the doctrine of CALVIN, had any reaſon to oppoſe each other with ſuch animoſity and bitterneſs, ſince the ſubjects of their debates were matters of an indifferent nature with reſpect to ſalvation, and might be variouſly explained and underſtood without any prejudice to their eternal intereſts. The chief leaders of theſe Latitudinarians were HALES and CHILLINGWORTH, whoſe names are ſtill pronounced in *England* with that veneration that is due to diſtinguiſhed wiſdom and rational piety [*d*]. The reſpectable names of MORE,

---

[c] See BURNET's *Hiſtory of his own Times*, vol. i. book ii. p. 188.

[*d*] The life of the ingenious and worthy Mr. HALES was compoſed in Engliſh by M. DES MAIZEAUX, and publiſhed in 8vo. at *London*, in the year 1719; it was conſiderably augmented in the Latin tranſlation of it, which I prefixed to the account of the ſynod of *Dort*, drawn from the letters of that great man, and publiſhed at *Hamburgh* in 1724. A life of Mr. HALES, written in French, is to be found in the firſt volume of the French tranſlation of CHILLINGWORTH's *Religion of Proteſtants*, &c.—The life of CHILLINGWORTH alſo was drawn up by DES MAIZEAUX in Engliſh; and a French tranſlation of it appeared, in the year 1730, at the head of the excellent book now mentioned, which was tranſlated into that language, and publiſhed at *Amſterdam*, in three volumes 8vo, in the year 1730. Thoſe who are deſirous of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the doctrines, government, laws, and preſent ſtate of the church of *England*, will do well to read the hiſtory of theſe two men; and more eſpecially to peruſe CHILLINGWORTH's admirable book already mentioned, I mean, *The Religion of Proteſtants a ſafe Way to Salvation.*

CUDWORTH, GALE, WHICHCOT, and TILLOTSON, add a high degree of luſtre to this eminent liſt. The undertaking of theſe great men was, indeed, bold and perilous; and it drew upon them much oppoſition and many bitter reproaches. They received, as the firſt fruits of their charitable zeal, the odious appellations of Atheiſts, Deiſts, and Socinians, both from the Roman Catholics and the more rigid of the contending Proteſtant parties; but, upon the reſtoration of King CHARLES II., they were raiſed to the firſt dignities of the church, and were deſervedly held in univerſal eſteem. It is alſo well known, that, even at this preſent time, the church of *England* is chiefly governed by *Latitudinarians* of this kind, though there be among both biſhops and clergy, from time to time, eccleſiaſtics who breathe the narrow and deſpotic ſpirit of LAUD, and who, in the language of faction, are called *High-churchmen*, or *Church-tories* [e].

The ſtate of the church of *England* under Charles II. and his ſucceſſors.

XXV. No ſooner was CHARLES II. re-eſtabliſhed on the throne of his anceſtors, than the ancient forms of eccleſiaſtical government and public worſhip were reſtored with him; and the biſhops reinſtated in their dignities and honours. The *Non-conformiſts* hoped, that *they* ſhould be allowed to ſhare ſome part of the honours and revenues of the church; but their expectations were totally diſappointed, and the face of affairs changed very ſuddenly with reſpect to them. For CHARLES ſubjected to the government of biſhops the churches of *Scotland* and *Ireland*, the former of which was peculiarly attached to the eccleſiaſtical diſcipline and polity of *Geneva*; and, in the year 1662, a public law was enacted, by which all who refuſed to obſerve the rites, and ſubſcribe the doctrines, of the church of *England*, were entirely excluded from its communion [f]. From this period, until the reign of King WILLIAM III., the *Non-conformiſts* were in a precarious and changing ſituation, ſometimes involved in calamity and trouble, at others enjoying ſome intervals of tranquillity and certain gleams of hope, according to the varying ſpirit of the court and miniſtry, but never entirely free from perplexities and fears [g]. But, in the year 1689, their affairs took a favourable turn, when a bill for the *toleration* of all Proteſtant diſſenters from the church of *England*, except the Socinians, paſſed in parliament almoſt without oppoſition, and delivered them from the penal laws to which they had been ſubjected by the *Act of Uniformity*, and other acts paſſed under the houſe of STUART [h]. Nor did the

---

[e] See RAPIN'*s Diſſertation on the Whigs and Tories.* ☞ See an admirable defence of the *Latitudinarian* divines, in a book entitled, *The Principles and Practices of certain moderate Divines of the Church of England (greatly miſunderſtood) truly repreſented and defended.* London, 1670, in 8vo. This book was written by Dr. FOWLER, afterwards biſhop of *Glouceſter.* N.

☞ [f] This was the famous *Act of Uniformity*, in conſequence of which the validity of Preſbyterian ordination was renounced; the miniſtrations of the foreign churches diſowned; the terms of conformity rendered more difficult and raiſed higher than before the civil wars; and by which (contrary to the manner of proceeding in the times of ELIZABETH and CROMWELL, who, both, reſerved for the ſubſiſtence of each ejected clergyman a fifth part of his benefice) no proviſion was made for thoſe who ſhould be deprived of their livings. See WILKINS's *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ*, tom iv. p. 573.—BURNET's *Hiſtory of his own Times*, vol. ii. p. 190, &c.—NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, tom. iv. p. 358.

[g] See the whole fourth volume of NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*.

[h] This was called the *Toleration Act*, and it may be ſeen at length in the *Appendix*, ſubjoined to the fourth volume of NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*. ☞ It is entitled, *An act for exempting their Majeſties Proteſtant Subjects, diſſenting from the Church of England, from the Penalties of certain Laws*. In this bill the *Corporation* and *Teſt-Acts* are omitted, and conſequently ſtill remain in force. The *Socinians* are alſo excepted; but proviſion

the Proteſtant diſſenters in *England* enjoy alone the benefits of this act; for it extended alſo to the Scots church, which was permitted thereby to follow the eccleſiaſtical diſcipline of *Geneva*, and was delivered from the juriſdiction of biſhops, and from the forms of worſhip that were annexed to epiſcopacy. It is from this period that the Nonconformiſts date the liberty and tranquillity they have long been bleſſed with, and ſtill enjoy; but it is alſo obſervable, that it is to the tranſactions that were carried on during this period, in favour of religious liberty, that we muſt chiefly impute the multitude of religious ſects and factions, that ſtart up from time to time in that free and happy iſland, and involve its inhabitants in the perplexities of religious diviſion and controverſy [i].

The High-church and Non-jurors.

XXVI. In the reign of King William, and in the year 1689, the diviſions among the friends of epiſcopacy ran high, and terminated in that famous ſchiſm in the church of *England*, which has never hitherto been entirely healed. Sancroft, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and ſeven of the other biſhops [ii], all of whom were eminently diſtinguiſhed both by their learning and their virtue, looked upon it as unlawful to take the oaths of allegiance to the new king, from a miſtaken notion that James II., though baniſhed from his

---

proviſion is made for *Quakers*, upon their making a *ſolemn declaration*, inſtead of taking the oaths to the government. This act excuſes *Proteſtant* Diſſenters from the penalties of the laws therein mentioned, provided they take the oaths to the government, and ſubſcribe the *Doctrinal Articles* of the church of *England*.

[i] Burnet's *Hiſtory of his own Times*, vol. ii. p. 23.

☞ [ii] The other Non-juring biſhops were, Dr. Lloyd, biſhop of *Norwich*; Dr. Turner, of *Ely*; Dr. Kenn, of *Bath* and *Wells*; Dr. Frampton, of *Glouceſter*; Dr. Thomas, of *Worceſter*; Dr. Lake, of *Chicheſter*; Dr. White, biſhop of *Peterborough*.

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART II.

dominions, remained, nevertheleſs, their rightful ſovereign. As theſe ſcruples were deeply rooted, and no arguments nor exhortations could engage theſe prelates to acknowledge the title of WILLIAM III. to the crown of *Great Britain*, they were deprived of their eccleſiaſtical dignities, and their ſees were filled by other men of eminent merit [*iii*]. The depoſed biſhops and clergy formed a new epiſcopal church, which differed, in certain points of doctrine and certain circumſtances of public worſhip, from the eſtabliſhed church of *England*. This new religious community were denominated *Non-jurors*, on account of their refuſing to take the oath of allegiance, and were alſo called the *High-church*, on account of the high notions they entertained of the dignity and power of the church, and the extent they gave to its prerogatives and juriſdiction. Thoſe, on the other hand, who diſapproved of this ſchiſm, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their charity and moderation towards Diſſenters, and were leſs ardent in extending the limits of eccleſiaſtical authority, were denominated *Low-churchmen* [*k*]. The biſhops who were deprived of their eccleſiaſtical dignities, and thoſe who embarked in their

---

☞ [*iii*] Theſe were TILLOTSON, MOORE, PATRICK, KIDDER, FOWLER, and CUMBERLAND, names that will be ever pronounced with veneration by ſuch as are capable of eſteeming ſolid, well-employed learning and genuine piety; and that will always ſhine among the brighteſt ornaments of the church of *England*.

[*k*] The denomination of *High-church* is given certainly, with great propriety, to the *Non-jurors*, who have very proud notions of church-power; but it is commonly uſed in a more extenſive ſignification, and is applied to all thoſe who, though far from being *Non-jurors*, or otherwiſe diſaffected to the preſent happy eſtabliſhment, yet form pompous and ambitious conceptions of the authority and juriſdiction of the church, and would raiſe it to an abſolute independence on all human power. Many ſuch are to be found even among thoſe who go under the general denomination of the *Low-church* party.

cauſe, maintained openly, that the church was independent on the juriſdiction of king and parliament, ſubject to the authority of God alone, and empowered to govern itſelf by its own laws; that, of conſequence, the ſentence pronounced againſt theſe prelates by the great council of the nation was deſtitute both of juſtice and validity; and that it was only by the decree of an eccleſiaſtical council that a biſhop could be depoſed. This high notion of the authority and prerogatives of the church was maintained and propagated, with peculiar zeal, by the famous HENRY DODWELL, who led the way in this important cauſe, and who, by his example and abilities, formed a conſiderable number of champions for its defence; hence aroſe a very nice and intricate controverſy, concerning the nature, privileges, and authority of the church, which has not yet been brought to a ſatisfactory concluſion [l].

XXVII. The

☞ [l] DODWELL himſelf was deprived of his profeſſorſhip of hiſtory for refuſing to take the oaths of allegiance to king WILLIAM and queen MARY; and this circumſtance, no doubt, augmented the zeal with which he intereſted himſelf in the defence of the biſhops, who were ſuſpended for the ſame reaſon. It was on this occaſion that he publiſhed his *Cautionary Diſcourſe of Schiſm, with a particular regard to the caſe of the biſhops who are ſuſpended for refuſing to take the new oath.* This book was fully refuted by the learned Dr. HODY, in the year 1691, in a work, intitled, *The unreaſonableneſs of a ſeparation from the new biſhops: or a Treatiſe out of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, ſhewing, that although a biſhop was unjuſtly deprived, neither he nor the church ever made a ſeparation, if the ſucceſſor was not a heretic;* tranſlated out of *an ancient Greek manuſcript,* (viz. among the Boroccian MSS.) *in the public library at* Oxford. The learned author tranſlated this work afterwards into Latin, and prefixed to it ſome pieces out of eccleſiaſtical antiquity, relative to the ſame ſubject. DODWELL publiſhed in 1692 an anſwer to it, which he called, *A vindication of the deprived biſhops,* &c. to which Dr. HODY replied in a treatiſe, intitled, *The Caſe of the Sees vacant by an unjuſt or uncanonical Deprivation ſtated, in reply to the Vindication,* &c. The controverſy did

High-church principles.

XXVII. The *Non-jurors* or *High-churchmen*, who boaſt with peculiar oſtentation of their orthodoxy, and treat the *Low-church* as unſound and ſchiſmatical, differ in ſeveral things from the members of the epiſcopal church, in its preſent eſtabliſhment; but they are more particularly diſtinguiſhed by the following principles: 1. *That it is never lawful for the people, under any provocation or pretext whatever, to reſiſt the ſovereign.* This is called in *England paſſive obedience*, and is a doctrine warmly oppoſed by many, who think it both lawful and neceſſary, in certain circumſtances, and in caſes of an urgent and momentous nature, to reſiſt the prince for the happineſs of the people. They maintain further, 2. *That the hereditary ſucceſſion to the throne is of divine inſtitution, and therefore can never be interrupted, ſuſpended, or annulled, on any pretext.* 3. *That the church is ſubject to the juriſdiction, not of the civil magiſtrate, but of God alone, particularly in matters of a religious nature.* 4. *That, conſequently,* SANCROFT and the other biſhops, *depoſed by King* WILLIAM III., *remained, notwithſtanding their depoſition,* TRUE BISHOPS *to the day of their death; and that thoſe who were ſubſtituted in their places were the unjuſt poſſeſſors of other men's property.* 5. *That theſe unjuſt poſſeſſors of eccleſiaſtical dignities were rebels againſt the ſtate, as well as ſchiſmatics in the church; and that*

---

did not end here; and it was the hardeſt thing in the world to reduce Mr. DODWELL to ſilence. Accordingly he came forth a third time with his ſtiff and rigid polemicks, and publiſhed, in 1695, his *Defence of the Vindication of the deprived biſhops.* The preface which he deſigned to prefix to this work was at firſt ſuppreſſed, but appeared afterwards under the following title: *The Doctrine of the Church of England concerning the Independency of the Clergy on the lay-power, as to thoſe rights of theirs which are purely ſpiritual, reconciled with our oath of ſupremacy and the lay-deprivation of the Popiſh biſhops in the beginning of the Reformation.* Several other pamphlets were publiſhed on the ſubject of this controverſy.

all, therefore, who held communion with them were alſo chargeable with rebellion and ſchiſm. 6. That this ſchiſm, which rents the church in pieces, is a moſt heinous ſin, whoſe puniſhment muſt fall heavy upon all thoſe who do not return ſincerely to the true church, from which they have departed [m].

Theological contests among the Dutch.

XXVIII. It will now be proper to change the ſcene, and to conſider a little the ſtate of the Reformed church in *Holland*. The Dutch Calviniſts thought themſelves happy after the defeat of the Arminians, and were flattering themſelves with the agreeable proſpect of enjoying long, in tranquillity and repoſe, the fruits of their victory, when new ſcenes of tumult aroſe from another quarter. Scarcely had they triumphed over the enemies of abſolute predeſtination, when, by an ill hap, they became the prey of inteſtine diſputes, and were divided among themſelves in ſuch a deplorable manner, that, during the whole of this century, the United Provinces were a ſcene of contention, animoſity, and ſtrife. It is not neceſſary to mention all the ſubjects of theſe religious quarrels; nor indeed would this be an eaſy taſk. We ſhall therefore paſs over in ſilence the debates of certain divines, who diſputed about ſome particular, though not very momentous, points of doctrine and diſcipline; ſuch as thoſe of the famous VOET and the learned DES MARETS; as alſo the diſputes of SALMASIUS, BOXHORN, VOET, and others, concerning uſury, ornaments in dreſs, ſtage-plays, and other minute points of morality; and the conteſts of APPOLLONIUS, TRIGLAND, and VIDELIUS, concerning the power of the magiſtrate in matters of religion and eccle-

---

[m] See WHISTON's *Memoirs of his Life and Writings*, vol. i. p. 30.—HICKES's *Memoirs of the Life of* JOHN KETTLEWELL, Printed at *London* in 1718.—*Nouveau Diction. Hiſtor. et Critiq.* at the article COLLIER.—PH. MASSON, *Hiſtor. Critique de la Repub. des Lettres*, tom. xiii. p. 298.

ſiaſtical diſcipline, which produced ſuch a flaming diviſion between FREDERIC SPANHEIM and JOHN VANDER WAYEN. Theſe and other debates of like nature and importance rather diſcover the ſentiments of certain learned men, concerning ſome particular points of religion and morality, than exhibit a view of the true internal ſtate of the Belgic church. The knowledge of this muſt be derived from thoſe controverſies alone in which the whole church, or at leaſt the greateſt part of its doctors, have been directly concerned.

The Carteſian and Cocceian controverſies.

XXIX. Such were the controverſies occaſioned in *Holland* by the philoſophy of DES CARTES, and the theological novelties of COCCEIUS. Hence aroſe the two powerful and numerous factions, diſtinguiſhed by the denominations of *Cocceians* and *Voetians*, which ſtill ſubſiſt, though their debates are now leſs violent, and their champions ſomewhat more moderate, than they were in former times. The Cocceian theology and the Carteſian philoſophy have, indeed, no common features, nor any thing, in their reſpective tenets and principles, that was in the leaſt adapted to form a connexion between them: and, of conſequence, the debates they excited, and the factions they produced, had no natural relation to, or dependance on, each other. It nevertheleſs ſo happened, that the reſpective votaries of theſe very *different* ſciences formed themſelves into one ſect; ſo far at leaſt, that thoſe who choſe COCCEIUS for their guide in theology, took DES CARTES for their maſter in philoſophy [n]. This will appear leſs ſurpriſing when we conſider, that the very ſame perſons who oppoſed the progreſs of *Carteſianiſm* in *Holland* were the warm adverſaries of the *Cocceian* theology; for this oppoſition, equally levelled at theſe two great men and their reſpective ſyſtems, laid the *Carteſians* and *Cocceians* under a kind of neceſſity of uniting their force in order to defend their cauſe, in a more effectual manner, againſt the formidable attacks of their numerous adverſaries. The *Voetians* were ſo called from GISBERT VOET, a learned and eminent profeſſor of divinity in the univerſity of *Utrecht*, who firſt ſounded the alarm of this theologico-philoſophical war, and led on, with zeal, the polemic legions againſt thoſe who followed the ſtandard of DES CARTES and COCCEIUS.

---

[n] See FRID. SPANHEMII *Epiſtola de noviſſimis in Belgio diſſidiis*, tom. ii. opp. p. 973.

Carteſian controverſy.

XXX. The Carteſian philoſophy, at its firſt appearance, attracted the attention and eſteem of many, and ſeemed more conformable to truth and nature, as well as more elegant and pleaſing in its aſpect, than the intricate labyrinths of Peripatetic wiſdom. It was conſidered in this light in *Holland*; it however met there with a formidable adverſary, in the year 1639, in the famous VOET, who taught theology at *Utrecht* with the greateſt reputation, and gave plain intimations of his looking upon Carteſianiſm as a ſyſtem of impiety. VOET was a man of uncommon application and immenſe learning; he had made an extraordinary progreſs in all the various branches of erudition and philology; but he was not endowed with a large portion of that philoſophical ſpirit, that judges with acuteneſs and preciſion of natural ſcience and abſtract truths. While DES CARTES reſided at *Utrecht*, VOET found fault with many things in his philoſophy; but what induced him to caſt upon it the aſperſion of impiety, was its being introduced by the following principles: "That the perſon who aſpires after the "character of a true philoſopher muſt begin by "doubting of all things, even of the exiſtence "of a Supreme Being—that the nature or *eſſence* "of ſpirit, and even of God himſelf, conſiſts in "*thought*—that ſpace has no real exiſtence, is no "more than the creature of fancy, and that, con"ſequently, *matter* is without bounds."

DES CARTES defended his principles, with his uſual acuteneſs, againſt the profeſſor of *Utrecht*; his diſciples and followers thought themſelves obliged, on this occaſion, to aſſiſt their maſter; and thus war was formally declared. On the other hand, VOET was not only ſeconded by thoſe Belgic divines that were the moſt eminent, at this time, for the extent of their learning and the ſoundneſs of their theology, ſuch as RIVET, DES MARETS, and MASTRICHT, but alſo was followed and applauded by the greateſt part of the Dutch clergy [o]. While the flame of controverſy burned with ſufficient ardour, it was conſiderably augmented by the proceedings of certain doctors, who applied the principles and tenets of DES CARTES to the illuſtration of theological truth. Hence, in the year 1656, an alarm was raiſed in the Dutch churches and ſchools of learning, and a reſolution was taken in ſeveral of their eccleſiaſtical aſſemblies (commonly called *Claſſes*), to make head againſt Carteſianiſm, and not to permit that *imperious* philoſophy to make ſuch encroachments upon the domain of theology. The States of *Holland* not only approved of this reſolution, but alſo gave it new force and efficacy by a public edict, iſſued out the very ſame year, by which both the profeſſors of philoſophy and theology were forbidden either to explain the writings of DES CARTES to the youth under their care, or to illuſtrate the doctrines of the Goſpel by the principles of philoſophy. It was further reſolved, in an aſſembly of the clergy, held at *Delft* the year following, that no candidate for holy orders ſhould be received into the miniſtry before he made a ſolemn declaration, that he would neither promote the Carteſian philoſophy, nor disfigure the divine ſimplicity of religion, by loading it with foreign ornaments. Laws of a like tenor were afterwards paſſed in the *United Provinces*, and in other countries [*p*]. But, as there is in human nature a ſtrange propenſity to ſtruggle againſt authority, and to purſue, with a peculiar degree of ardour, things that are forbidden, ſo it happened, that all theſe edicts proved inſufficient to ſtop the progreſs of Carteſianiſm, which, at length, obtained a ſolid and permanent footing in the ſeminaries of learning, and was applied, both in the academies and pulpits, and ſometimes indeed very prepoſterouſly, to explain the truths and precepts of Chriſtianity. Hence it was, that the *United Provinces* were divided into the two great factions already mentioned; and that the whole remainder of this century was ſpent amidſt their contentions and debates.

---

[o] See BAILLET's *Vie de M.* DES CARTES, tom. ii. chap. v. p. 33.—DANIEL, *Voyage du Monde de* DES CARTES, tom. i. *de ſes Oeuvres*, p. 84.

The ſentiments of Cocceius concerning the Holy Scriptures.

XXXI. John Cocceius, a native of *Bremen*, and profeſſor of divinity in the Univerſity of *Leyden*, might have certainly paſſed for a great man, had his vaſt erudition, his exuberant fancy, his ardent piety, and his uncommon application to the ſtudy of the Scriptures, been under the direction of a ſound and ſolid judgment. This ſingular man introduced into theology a multitude of new tenets and ſtrange notions, which had never before entered into the brain of any other mortal, or at leaſt had never been heard of before his time: for, in the firſt place, as has been already hinted, his manner of explaining the Holy Scriptures was totally different from that of Calvin and his followers. Departing entirely from the admirable ſimplicity that reigns in the commentaries of that great man, Cocceius repreſented the whoſe hiſtory of the Old Teſtament as a mirror, that held forth an accurate view of the tranſactions and events that were to happen in the church under the diſpenſation of the New Teſtament, and unto the end of the world. He even went ſo far, as to maintain, that the miracles, actions, and ſufferings of Christ, and of his apoſtles, during the courſe of their miniſtry, were *types* and images of future events. He affirmed, that by far the greateſt part of the ancient prophecies foretold Christ's miniſtry and mediation, and the riſe, progreſs, and revolutions of the church, not only under the figure of perſons and *tranſactions*, but in a literal manner, and by the very ſenſe of the *words* uſed in theſe predictions. And he completed the extravagance of this chimerical ſyſtem, by turning, with wonderful art and dexterity, into holy riddles and typical predictions, even thoſe paſſages of the Old Teſtament that ſeemed deſigned for no other purpoſe than to celebrate the praiſes of the Deity, or to convey ſome religious truth, or to inculcate ſome rule of practice. In order to give an air of ſolidity and plauſibility to theſe odd notions, he firſt laid it down as a fundamental rule of interpretation, "That "the *words* and *phraſes* of Scripture are to be un"derſtood *in every ſenſe* of which they are *ſuſcep*"*tible*; or, in other words, that they ſignify, *in* "*effect*, every thing that they *can* poſſibly ſignify;" a rule this, which, when followed by a man who had more imagination than judgment, could not fail to produce very extraordinary comments on the ſacred writings. After having laid down this ſingular rule of interpretation, he divided the whole hiſtory of the church into *ſeven periods*, conformable to the ſeven *trumpets* and *ſeals* mentioned in the *Revelations*.

[*p*] Frid. Spanheim, *De noviſſimis in Belgio diſſidiis*, tom. ii. opp. p. 959.—The reader may alſo conſult the hiſtorians of this century, ſuch as Arnold, Weismann, Jager, Caroli, and alſo Walchius's *Hiſtor. Controverſ. Germanic.* tom. iii.

Concerning the doctrinal part of theology.

XXXII. One of the great deſigns formed by Cocceius, was that of ſeparating theology from philoſophy, and of confining the Chriſtian doctors, in their explications of the former, to the words and phraſes of the Holy Scriptures. Hence it was, that, finding in the language of the ſacred writers, the Goſpel-diſpenſation repreſented under the image of a *Covenant* made between God and man, he looked upon the uſe of this image as admirably adapted to exhibit a complete and well-connected ſyſtem of religious truth. But while he was labouring this point, and endeavouring to accommodate the circumſtances and characters of human contracts to the diſpenſations of divine wiſdom, which they repreſent in ſuch an inaccurate and imperfect manner, he fell imprudently into ſome erroneous notions. Such was his opinion concerning the covenant made between God and the Jewiſh nation by the miniſtry and the mediation of Moses, "which he affirmed to be "of the ſame nature with the New Covenant ob"tained by the mediation of Jesus Christ." In conſequence of this general principle, he maintained, "That the *Ten Commandments* were pro"mulgated by Moses, not as a *rule of obedience*, "but as a *repreſentation of the Covenant of Grace*— "that when the Jews had provoked the Deity, "by their various tranſgreſſions, particularly by "the worſhip of the golden calf, the ſevere and "ſervile yoke of the ceremonial law was added "to the *decalogue*, as a puniſhment inflicted on "them by the Supreme Being in his righteous "diſpleaſure—that this yoke, which was painful "in itſelf, became doubly ſo on account of its "*typical* ſignification; ſince it admoniſhed the "Iſraelites, from day to day, of the imperfection

“ and uncertainty of their ſtate, filled them with “ anxiety, and was a ſtanding and perpetual “ proof that they had merited the diſpleaſure of “ GOD, and could not expect, before the coming “ of the MESSIAH, the entire remiſſion of their “ tranſgreſſions and iniquities—that, indeed, good “ men, even under the Moſaic diſpenſation, “ were immediately after death made partakers “ of everlaſting happineſs and glory; but that “ they were, nevertheleſs, during the whole “ courſe of their lives, far removed from that “ firm hope and *aſſurance* of ſalvation, which re- “ joices the faithful under the diſpenſation of the “ Goſpel—and that their anxiety flowed natural- “ ly from this conſideration, that their ſins, “ though they remained unpuniſhed, were not “ pardoned, becauſe CHRIST had not, as yet, of- “ fered himſelf up a ſacrifice to the Father to make “ an entire atonement for them.” Theſe are the principal lines that diſtinguiſh the *Cocceian* from other ſyſtems of theology; it is attended, indeed, with other peculiarities; but we ſhall paſs them over in ſilence, as of little moment, and unworthy of notice. Theſe notions were warmly oppoſed by the ſame perſons that declared war againſt the Carteſian philoſophy; and the conteſt was carried on for many years with various ſucceſs. But, in the iſſue, the doctrines of COCCEIUS, like thoſe of DES CARTES, ſtood their ground; and neither the dexterity nor vehemence of his adverſaries could exclude his diſciples from the public ſeminaries of learning, or hinder them from propagating, with ſurpriſing ſucceſs and rapidity, the tenets of their maſter in *Germany* and *Switzerland* [q].

---

[q] See BAILLET’s *Vie de M.* DES CARTES, tom. ii. p. 35. —DANIEL, *Voyage du Monde de* DES CARTÈS.—VAL. ALBERTI Διπλῶν καππά, *Carteſianiſmus et Cocceianiſmus deſcripti et refutati. Lipſ.* 1678, in 4to.

XXXIII. The

The con-troverſy ſet on foot by Roell, concerning the uſe of reaſon in religion.

XXXIII. The other controverſies, that divided the Belgic church during this century, all aroſe from the immoderate propenſity that certain doctors diſcovered towards an alliance between the Carteſian philoſophy and their theological ſyſtem. This will appear, with the utmoſt evidence, from the debates excited by ROELL and BECKER, which ſurpaſſed all the others, both by the importance of their ſubjects and by the noiſe they made in the world. About the year 1686, certain Carteſian doctors of divinity, headed by the ingenious HERMAN ALEXANDER ROELL, profeſſor of theology in the Univerſity of *Franeker*, ſeemed to attribute to the dictates of reaſon a more extenſive authority in religious matters, than they had hitherto been poſſeſſed of. The controverſy occaſioned by this innovation was reducible to the two following queſtions: "1. Whether "the divine origin and authority of the Holy "Scriptures can be demonſtrated by reaſon alone, "or whether an inward teſtimony of the Holy "Spirit in the hearts of Chriſtians be neceſſary in "order to the firm belief of this fundamental "point? 2. Whether the ſacred writings pro-"poſe to us, as an object of faith, any thing that "is repugnant to the dictates of right reaſon?" Theſe queſtions were anſwered, the former in the affirmative, and the latter in the negative, not only by ROELL, but alſo by VANDER WAYEN, WESSELIUS, DUKER, RUARDUS AB ANDALA, and other doctors, who were oppoſed in this by ULRIC NUBER, an eminent lawyer, GERARD DE VRIES, and others of inferior note [r]. The flame excited by this controverſy ſpread itſelf far and wide through the *United Provinces*; and its progreſs was increaſing from day to day, when the ſtates of *Frieſland* prudently interpoſed to reſtore the peace of the church, by impoſing ſilence on the contending parties. Thoſe whoſe curioſity may engage them to examine with attention and accuracy the points debated in this controverſy, will find, that a very conſiderable part of it was merely a diſpute about words; and that the real difference of ſentiment that there was between theſe learned diſputants might have been eaſily accommodated, by proper explications on both ſides.

---

[r] See LE CLERC. *Biblioth. Univerſ. et Hiſtorique*, tom. vi. p. 388.

Sentiments of Roell concerning the generation of the Son of God.

XXXIV. Not long after this controverſy had been huſhed, ROELL alarmed the orthodoxy of his colleagues, and more particularly of the learned VITRINGA, by ſome other new tenets, that rendered the ſoundneſs of his religious principles extremely doubtful, not only in their opinion, but alſo in the judgment of many Dutch divines [s]: for he maintained, "That the account we have of the "*generation* of the *Son* in the ſacred writings is not "to be underſtood in a literal ſenſe, or as a real "generation of a natural kind;" he alſo affirmed, "That the afflictions and death of the right"eous are as truly the *penal* effects of original "ſin, as the afflictions and death of the wicked "and impenitent;" and he entertained notions concerning the *divine decrees*, *original ſin*, the *ſatiſfaction* of CHRIST, and other points of leſs moment, which differed in reality, or by the manner of expreſſing them ſeemed to differ greatly, from the doctrines received and eſtabliſhed in the Dutch church [t]. The magiſtrates of *Frieſland* uſed
all

---

[s] For an account of ROELL, ſee the *Bibliotheca Bremenſ. Theologico-Philolog.* tom. ii. p. vi. p. 707.—CASP. BURMANNI *Trajectum Eruditum*, p. 306.

[t] Thoſe who are deſirous of the moſt accurate account of the errors of ROELL, will find them enumerated in a public piece compoſed by the *Faculty of Theology* at *Leyden*, in order to confirm the ſentence of condemnation that had been pronounced

all the precautions that prudence could ſuggeſt, to prevent theſe controverſies from being propagated in their province; and enacted ſeveral laws for this purpoſe, all tending towards peace and ſilence. This conduct, however, was not imitated by the other provinces, where ROELL and his diſciples were condemned, both in private and in public, as heretics and corrupters of divine truth [tt]. Nor did the death of this eminent man extinguiſh the animoſity and reſentment of his adverſaries; for his diſciples are ſtill treated with ſeverity; and, notwithſtanding the ſolemn proteſtations they have given of the ſoundneſs and purity of their religious ſentiments, labour under the imputation of many concealed errors.

---

nounced againſt them by the Dutch ſynods; this piece is entitled, *Judicium Eccleſiaſticum, quo opiniones quædem Cl.* H. A. ROELLII *Synodice damnatæ ſunt laudatum a Profeſſoribus Theologiæ in Academiâ Lugduno-Batavia. Lugd. Batav.* 1713, in 4to.

☞ [tt] This affirmation is ſomewhat exaggerated, at leaſt we muſt not conclude from it, that ROELL was either depoſed or perſecuted; for he exerciſed the functions of his profeſſorſhip for ſeveral years after this at *Franeker*, and was afterwards called to the chair of divinity at *Utrecht*, and that upon the moſt honourable and advantageous terms. The ſtates of *Frieſland* publiſhed an edict enjoining ſilence, and forbidding all profeſſors, paſtors, &c. in *their* province to teach the particular opinions of ROELL; and this pacific divine ſacrificed the propagation of his opinions to the love of peace and concord. His notion concerning the Trinity did not eſſentially differ from the doctrine generally received upon that myſterious and unintelligible ſubject; and his deſign ſeemed to be no more than to prevent Chriſtians from *humanizing* the relation between the *Father* and the *Son*. But this was wounding his brethren, the rigorous ſyſtematic divines, in a tender point; for if *Anthropomorphiſm*, or the cuſtom of attributing to the Deity the kind of procedure in acting and judging that is uſual among men (who reſemble him only as imperfection reſembles perfection); was baniſhed from theology, orthodoxy would be deprived of ſome of its moſt precious phraſes, and our confeſſions of faith and ſyſtems of doctrine would be reduced within much narrower bounds.

The conteſt occaſioned by the peculiar ſentiments of Becker.

XXXV. The controverſy ſet on foot by the ingenious BALTHAZAR BECKER, miniſter at *Amſterdam*, muſt not be omitted here. This learned eccleſiaſtic took occaſion, from the Carteſian definition of *ſpirit*, of the truth and preciſion of which he was intimately perſuaded, to deny boldly all the accounts we have in the Holy Scriptures of the ſeduction, influence, and operations of the devil and his infernal emiſſaries; as alſo all that has been ſaid in favour of the exiſtence of ghoſts, ſpectres, ſorcerers, and magicians. The long and laboured work he publiſhed, in the year 1691, upon this intereſting ſubject, is ſtill extant. In this ſingular production, which bears the title of *The World Bewitched*, he modifies and perverts, with the greateſt ingenuity, but alſo with equal temerity and preſumption, the accounts given by the ſacred writers of the power of Satan and wicked angels, and of perſons poſſeſſed by evil ſpirits; he affirms, moreover, that the unhappy and malignant being, who is called in Scripture *Satan*, or the *Devil*, is chained down with his infernal miniſters in Hell; ſo that he can never come forth from this eternal priſon to terrify mortals, or to ſeduce the righteous from the paths of virtue. According to the Carteſian definition above mentioned, the *eſſence of ſpirit* conſiſts in *thought*; and, from this definition, BECKER drew his doctrine; ſince none of that influence, or of thoſe operations that are attributed to evil ſpirits, can be effected by mere *thinking* [u]. Rather,

---

☞ [u] Our hiſtorian relates here ſomewhat obſcurely the reaſoning which BECKER founded upon the Carteſian definition of mind or ſpirit. The tenor and amount of his argument is as follows: "The eſſence of mind is *thought*, and "the eſſence of matter is *extenſion*.—Now, ſince there is no "ſort of conformity or connexion between a *thought* and *ex*-"*tenſion*, mind cannot act upon matter unleſs theſe two ſub-"ſtances be united, as ſoul and body are in man:—therefore "no

Rather, therefore, than call into queſtion the accuracy or authority of DES CARTES, BECKER thought proper to force the narrations and doctrines of Scripture into a conformity with the principles and definitions of this philoſopher. Theſe errors, nevertheleſs, excited great tumults and diviſions, not only in all the *United Provinces*, but alſo in ſome parts of *Germany*, where ſeveral doctors of the Lutheran church were alarmed at its progreſs, and aroſe to oppoſe it [*w*]. Their inventor and promoter, though refuted victoriouſly by a multitude of adverſaries, and publicly depoſed from his paſtoral charge, died in the year 1718, in the full perſuaſion of the truth of theſe opinions, that had drawn upon him ſo much oppoſition, and profeſſed, with his laſt breath, his ſincere adherence to every thing he had written on that ſubject. Nor can it be ſaid, that this his doctrine died with him; ſince it is abundantly known, that it has ſtill many votaries and patrons, who either hold it in ſecret, or profeſs it publicly.

" no ſeparate ſpirits, either good or evil, can act upon mankind. " Such acting is *miraculous*, and miracles can be performed by " God alone. It follows of conſequence, that the Scripture-" accounts of the actions and operations of good and evil ſpi-" rits muſt be underſtood in an allegorical ſenſe." This is BECKER's argument; and it does, in truth, little honour to his acuteneſs and ſagacity. By proving too much, it proves nothing at all; for if the want of a connexion or conformity between thought and extenſion renders mind incapable of acting upon matter, it is hard to ſee how their union ſhould remove this incapacity, ſince the want of conformity and connexion remains notwithſtanding this union. Beſides, according to this reaſoning, the Supreme Being cannot act upon material beings. In vain does BECKER maintain the affirmative, by having recourſe to a miracle; for this would imply, that the whole courſe of nature was a ſeries of miracles, that is to ſay, that there are no miracles at all.

[*w*] See LILIENTHALII *Selectæ Hiſtoriæ Literar.* p. i. obſervat. ii. p. 17.—*Miſcellan. Lipſienſ.* tom. i. p. 361. 364. where there is an explication of a ſatirical medal, ſtruck to expoſe the ſentiments of BECKER. See alſo *Nouveau Diction. Hiſt. et Critique*, tom. i. p. 193.

Dutch ſects —Verſchoriſts, Hattemiſts.

XXXVI. The curious reader can be no ſtranger to the multitude of ſects, ſome Chriſtian, ſome Half-Chriſtian, ſome totally delirious, that have ſtarted up, at different times, both in *England* and *Holland.* It is difficult, indeed, for thoſe who live in other countries, to give accurate accounts of theſe ſeparatiſts, as the books that contain their doctrines and views are ſeldom diſperſed in foreign nations. We have, however, been lately favoured with ſome relations, that give a clearer idea of the Dutch ſects, called *Verſchoriſts* and *Hattemiſts,* than we had before entertained; and it will not therefore be improper to give here ſome account of theſe remarkable communities. The former derives its denomination from JACOB VERSCHOOR, a native of *Fluſhing,* who, in the year 1680, out of a perverſe and heterogeneous mixture of the tenets of COCCEIUS and SPINOZA, produced a new form of religion equally remarkable for its extravagance and impiety. His diſciples and followers were called *Hebrews,* on account of the zeal and aſſiduity with which they all, without diſtinction of age or ſex, applied themſelves to the ſtudy of the Hebrew language.

The *Hattemiſts* were ſo called from PONTIAN VAN HATTEM, a miniſter in the province of *Zeland,* who was alſo addicted to the ſentiments of SPINOZA, and was, on that account, degraded from his paſtoral office. The *Verſchoriſts* and *Hattemiſts* reſemble each other in their religious ſyſtems, though there muſt alſo be ſome points in which they differ; ſince it is well known, that VAN HATTEM could never perſuade the former to unite their ſect with his, and thus to form one communion. Neither of the two have abandoned the profeſſion of the Reformed religion; they affect, on the contrary, an apparent attachment to it; and HATTEM, in particular, publiſhed a treatiſe upon the *Catechiſm of Heidelberg.* If I underſtand

ſtand aright the imperfect relations that have been given of the ſentiments and principles of theſe two communities, both their founders began by perverting the doctrine of the Reformed church concerning *Abſolute Decrees*, ſo as to deduce it from the impious ſyſtem of a *fatal* and *uncontroulable neceſſity*. Having laid down this principle to account for the origin of all events, they went a ſtep further into the domain of Atheiſm, and denied "the difference between *moral good* and *evil*, "and the corruption of human nature." From hence they concluded, "That mankind were under no ſort of obligation to correct their manners, to improve their minds, or to endeavour after a regular obedience to the divine laws— that the whole of religion conſiſted not in *acting*, but in *ſuffering*—and that all the precepts of JESUS CHRIST are reducible to this ſingle one, that we bear with chearfulneſs and patience the events that happen to us through the divine will, and make it our conſtant and only ſtudy to maintain a permanent tranquillity of mind."

This, if we are not miſtaken, was the common doctrine of the two ſects under conſideration. There were, however, certain opinions or fancies, that were peculiar to HATTEM and his followers, who affirmed, "That CHRIST had not ſatisfied the divine juſtice, nor made an expiation for the ſins of men by his death and ſufferings, but had only ſignified to us, by his mediation, that there was nothing in us that could offend the Deity." HATTEM maintained, "that this was CHRIST's manner of juſtifying his ſervants, and preſenting them blameleſs before the tribunal of God." Theſe opinions ſeem perverſe and peſtilential in the higheſt degree; and they evidently tend to extinguiſh all virtuous ſentiments, and to diſſolve all moral obligation. It does not however appear, that either of theſe innovations directly recommended immorality and vice, or thought that men might ſafely follow, without any reſtraint, the impulſe of their irregular appetites and paſſions. It is at leaſt certain, that the following maxim is placed among their tenets, *that God does not puniſh men* FOR *their ſins, but* BY *their ſins*; and this maxim ſeems to ſignify, that, if a man does not reſtrain his irregular appetites, he muſt ſuffer the painful fruits of his licentiouſneſs, both in a preſent and future life, not in conſequence of any judicial ſentence pronounced by the will, or executed by the immediate hand of God, but according to ſome fixed law or conſtitution of nature [x]. The two ſects ſtill ſubſiſt, though they bear no longer the names of their founders.

The diſputes in *Switzerland* concerning the Conſenſus or form of concord.

XXXVII. The churches of *Switzerland*, ſo early as the year 1669, were alarmed at the progreſs which the opinions of AMYRAUT, DE LA PLACE, and CAPEL, were making in different countries; and they were apprehenſive that the doctrine they had received from CALVIN, and which had been ſo ſolemnly confirmed by the ſynod of *Dort*, might be altered and corrupted by theſe new improvements in theology. This apprehenſion was ſo much the leſs chimerical, as at that very time there were, among the clergy of *Geneva*, certain doctors eminent for their learning and eloquence, who not only adopted theſe new opinions, but were alſo deſirous, notwithſtanding the oppoſition and remonſtrances of their colleagues, of propagating them among the people [y]. To ſet bounds to the zeal of theſe innovators, and to ſtop the progreſs of the new doctrines, the learned JOHN HENRY HEIDEGGER, profeſſor of divinity at *Zurich*, was employed in the year 1675 by an aſſembly, compoſed of the moſt eminent Helvetic divines, to draw up a form of doctrine, in direct oppoſition to the tenets and principles of the celebrated French writers mentioned above. The magiſtrates were engaged, without much difficulty, to give this production the ſtamp of their authority; and to add to it the other confeſſions of faith received in the Helvetic church, under the peculiar denomination of the *Form of Concord*. This ſtep, which ſeemed to be taken with pacific views, proved an abundant ſource of diviſion and diſcord. Many declared, that they could not conſcientiouſly ſubſcribe this new *form*; and thus unhappy tumults and conteſts aroſe in ſeveral places. Hence it happened, that the canton of *Baſil* and the republic of *Geneva*, perceiving the inconveniencies that proceeded from this new article of church-communion, and ſtrongly ſolicited, in the year 1686, by FREDERIC WILLIAM, elector of *Brandenburg*, to eaſe the burthened conſciences of their clergy, abrogated this *form* [z]. It is nevertheleſs certain, that in the other cantons it maintained its authority for ſome time after this period; but, in our time, the diſcords

---

[x] See THEOD. HASÆ *Diſſert. in Muſeo Bremenſi Theol. Philolog.* vol. ii. p. 144.—*Bibliotheque Belgique*, tom. ii. p. 203.

[y] See LETI *Iſtoria Genevrina*, part iv. book v. p. 448. 488. 497, &c.

☞ [z] It muſt not be imagined, from this expreſſion of our hiſtorian, that this *Form*, entitled the *Conſenſus*, was abrogated at *Baſil* by a poſitive edict. The caſe ſtood thus: Mr. PETER WERENFELS, who was at the head of the eccleſiaſtical conſiſtory of that city, paid ſuch regard to the letter of the elector, as to avoid requiring a ſubſcription to this Form from the candidates for the miniſtry; and his conduct, in this reſpect, was imitated by his ſucceſſors. The remonſtrances of the elector do not ſeem to have had the ſame effect upon thoſe that governed the church of *Geneva*; for the *Conſenſus*, or *Form of Agreement*, maintained its credit and authority there until the year 1706, when, without being abrogated by any poſitive act, it fell into diſuſe. In ſeveral other parts of *Switzerland*, it was ſtill impoſed as a rule of faith, as appears by the letters addreſſed by GEORGE cords it has excited in many places, and more particularly in the Univerſity of *Lauſanne*, have contributed to deprive it of all its authority, and to ſink it into utter oblivion [a].

GEORGE I., king of *England*, as alſo by the king of *Pruſſia*, in the year 1723, to the Swiſs Cantons, in order to procure the abrogation of this *Form*, or *Conſenſus*, which was conſidered as an obſtacle to the union of the Reformed and Lutheran churches. See the *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire des troubles arrivées en Suiſſe à l'occaſion du Conſenſus*, publiſhed in 8vo at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1726.

[a] See CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFII *Schediaſma de Formulâ Conſenſus Helvetica*, publiſhed in 4to at *Tubingen*, in the year 1723.—*Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire des troubles arrivées en Suiſſe à l'occaſion du Conſenſus*.

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

SECTION II.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the ARMINIAN CHURCH.

The denomination of Arminians, whence.

I. THERE ſprung forth from the boſom of the Reformed church, during this century, two new ſects, whoſe birth and progreſs were, for a long time, painful and perplexing to the parent that bore them. Theſe ſects were the *Arminians* and *Quakers*, whoſe origin was owing to very different principles; ſince the *former* derived its exiſtence from an exceſſive propenſity to improve the faculty of reaſon, and to follow its dictates and diſcoveries; while the *latter* ſprung up, like a rank weed, from the neglect and contempt of human reaſon. The Arminians derive their name and their origin from JAMES ARMINIUS, or HARMENSEN, who was firſt paſtor at *Amſterdam*, afterwards profeſſor of divinity at *Leyden*, and who attracted the eſteem and applauſe of his very enemies, by his acknowledged candour, penetration, and piety [a]. They received alſo the denomination

---

[a] The moſt ample account we have of this eminent man is given by BRANDT, in his *Hiſtoria Vitæ* JAC. ARMINII, publiſhed at *Leyden* in 8vo, in 1724; and the year after by

me

nomination of *Remonſtrants*, from an humble petition, entitled their *Remonſtrances*, which they addreſſed, in the year 1610, to the ſtates of *Holland*, and as the patrons of Calviniſm preſented an addreſs, in oppoſition to this, which they called their *Counter-remonſtrances*, ſo did they, in conſequence thereof, receive the name of *Counter-remonſtrants*.

The commencement of Arminianiſm.

II. ARMINIUS, though he had imbibed in his tender years the doctrines of *Geneva*, and had even received his theological education in the univerſity of that city, yet rejected, when he arrived at the age of manhood, the ſentiments, concerning Predeſtination and the Divine Decrees, that are adopted by the greateſt part of the Reformed churches, and embraced the principles and communion of thoſe, whoſe religious ſyſtem extends the love of the Supreme Being, and the *merits* of JESUS CHRIST, to all mankind [*b*]. As time

---

me at *Brunſwick*, with an additional *Preface* and ſome *Annotations*. See alſo *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hiſtor. et Critique*, tom. i, p. 471. All the works of ARMINIUS are compriſed in one moderate *quarto* volume. The edition I have now before me was printed at *Francfort*, in the year 1634. They who would form a juſt and accurate notion of the temper, genius, and doctrine of this divine, will do well to peruſe, with particular attention, that part of his works that is known under the title of his *Diſputationes publicæ et privatæ*. There is, in his manner of reaſoning, and alſo in his phraſeology, ſome little remains of the ſcholaſtic jargon of that age; but we find, nevertheleſs, in his writings, upon the whole, much of that ſimplicity and perſpicuity which his followers have always looked upon, and ſtill conſider, as among the principal qualities of a Chriſtian miniſter. For an account of the Arminian *Confeſſions of Faith*, and the hiſtorical writers who have treated of this ſect, ſee JO. CHRIST. KOECHERUS, *Biblioth. Theol. Symbolicæ*, p. 481.

[*b*] BERTIUS, in his *Funeral Oration* on ARMINIUS, BRANDT, in his *Hiſtory of his Life*, p. 22. and almoſt all the eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians of this period, mention the occaſion of this change in the ſentiments of ARMINIUS. It happened in the year 1591, as appears from the remarkable letter of ARMINIUS

time and deep meditation had only ſerved to confirm him in theſe principles, he thought himſelf obliged, by the dictates both of candour and conſcience, to profeſs them publicly, when he had obtained the chair of divinity in the univerſity of *Leyden*, and to oppoſe the doctrine and ſentiments of CALVIN on theſe heads, which had been followed by the greateſt part of the Dutch clergy. Two conſiderations encouraged him, in a particular manner, to venture upon this open declaration of his ſentiments; for he was perſuaded, on the one hand, that there were many perſons, beſide himſelf, and, among theſe, ſome of the firſt rank and dignity, that were highly diſguſted at the doctrine of abſolute decrees; and, on the other, he knew that the Belgic doctors were neither obliged by their confeſſion of faith, nor by any other public law, to adopt and propagate the principles of CALVIN. Thus animated and encouraged, ARMINIUS taught his ſentiments publicly, with great freedom and equal ſucceſs, and perſuaded many of the truth of his doctrine; but as Calviniſm was at this time in a flouriſhing ſtate in *Holland*, this freedom procured him a multitude of enemies, and drew upon him the ſevereſt marks of diſapprobation and reſentment from thoſe that adhered to the theological ſyſtem of *Geneva*, and more eſpecially from FRANCIS GOMAR, his colleague. Thus commenced that long, tedious, and intricate controverſy, that afterwards made ſuch a noiſe in *Europe*. ARMINIUS died in the year 1609, when it was juſt beginning to involve his country in contention and diſcord [c].

III. After

ARMINIUS to GRYNÆUS, which bears date that ſame year, and in which the former propoſes to the latter ſome of his theological doubts. This letter is publiſhed in the *Biblioth. Brem. Theol. Philolog.* tom. iii. p. 384.

[c] The hiſtory of this controverſy, and of the public diſcords and tumults it occaſioned, is more circumſtantially related by BRANDT,

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART II.

The progreſs of Arminianiſm.

III. After the death of ARMINIUS, the combat ſeemed to be carried on, during ſome years, between the contending parties, with equal ſucceſs; ſo that it was not eaſy to foreſee which ſide would gain the aſcendant. The demands of the Arminians were moderate; they required no more than a bare toleration for their religious ſentiments [d]; and ſome of the firſt men in the republic, ſuch as OLDENBARNEVELDT, GROTIUS, HOOGERBEETS, and ſeveral others, looked upon theſe demands as reaſonable and juſt. It was the opinion of theſe great men, that as the points in debate had not been determined by the *Belgic confeſſion of faith*, every individual had an unqueſtionable right to judge for himſelf; and that more eſpecially in a free ſtate, which had thrown off the yoke of ſpiritual deſpotiſm and civil tyranny. In conſequence of this perſuaſion, they uſed their utmoſt efforts to accommodate matters, and left no methods unemployed to engage the Calviniſts to treat with Chriſtian moderation and forbearance

---

BRANDT, in the ſecond and third volumes of his *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, than by any other writer. This excellent hiſtory is written in Dutch; but there is an abridgment of it in French, in three volumes 8vo, which has been tranſlated into Engliſh. Add to this, UYTENBOGARD's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, written alſo in Dutch.—LIMBORCHI *Hiſtoria vitæ Epiſcopii*.—The *Epiſtolæ Clarorum Virorum*, publiſhed by LIMBORCH.—Thoſe who deſire a more conciſe view of this conteſt will find it in LIMBORCH's *Relatio Hiſtorica de origine et progreſſu Controverſiarum in Fœderato Belgio de Prædeſtinatione et capitibus annexis*, which is ſubjoined to the latter editions of his *Theologia Chriſtiana*; or Body of Divinity. It is true, all theſe are Arminians, and, as impartiality requires our hearing both ſides, the reader may conſult TRIGLAND's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, compoſed likewiſe in Dutch, and a prodigious number of Polemical writings publiſhed againſt the Arminians.

☞ [d] This toleration was offered them in the *conference* held at the *Hague*, in the year 1611, provided they would renounce the errors of Socinianiſm. See TRIGLAND, *loc. cit.*—See alſo HENRY BRANDT's *Collatio ſcripto habita Hagæcomitum*, printed at *Zericzée*, in 1715.

ance their diſſenting brethren. Theſe efforts were at firſt attended with ſome proſpect of ſucceſs. MAURICE, prince of *Orange*, and the Princeſs Dowager his mother, countenanced theſe pacific meaſures, though the former became afterwards one of the warmeſt adverſaries of the Arminians. Hence a conference was held, in the year 1611, at the *Hague*, between the contending parties; another at *Delft*, in the year 1613; and hence alſo that pacific edict iſſued out in 1614, by the ſtates of *Holland*, to exhort them to charity and mutual forbearance; not to mention a number of expedients applied in vain to prevent the ſchiſm that threatened the church [*e*]. But theſe meaſures confirmed, inſtead of removing, the apprehenſions of the Calviniſts; from day to day they were ſtill more firmly perſuaded, that the Arminians aimed at nothing leſs than the ruin of all religion; and hence they cenſured their magiſtrates with great warmth and freedom, for interpoſing their authority to promote peace and union with ſuch adverſaries [*f*]. And thoſe, who are well informed and impartial, muſt candidly acknowledge, that the Arminians were far from being ſufficiently cautious in avoiding connexions with perſons of looſe principles; and that by frequenting the company of thoſe, whoſe ſentiments were entirely different from the received doctrines of the Reformed church, they furniſhed their enemies with a pretext for ſuſpecting their own principles, and preſenting their theological ſyſtem in the worſt colours.

[*e*] The writers who have given accounts of theſe tranſactions are well known: we ſhall only mention the firſt and ſecond volumes of the *Hiſtoire de* LOUIS XIII., by LE VASSOR, who treats largely and accurately of theſe religious commotions, and of the civil tranſactions that were connected with them.

[*f*] The conduct of the States of *Holland*, who employed not only the language of perſuaſion, but alſo the voice of authority in order to calm theſe commotions, and reſtore peace in the church, was defended, with his uſual learning and eloquence, by GROTIUS, in two treatiſes. The one, which contains the general principles on which this defence is founded, is entitled, *De jure ſummarum poteſtatum circa ſacra*; the other, in which theſe principles are peculiarly applied in juſtifying the conduct of the States, was publiſhed, in the year 1613, under the following title: *Ordinum Hollandiæ ac Weſtfriſiæ Pietas a multorum calumniis vindicata*.

The five articles of Arminianiſm.

IV. It is worthy of obſervation, that this unhappy controverſy, which aſſumed another form, and was rendered more comprehenſive by new ſubjects of contention, after the ſynod of *Dort*, was, at this time, confined to the doctrines relating to Predeſtination and Grace. The ſentiments of the Arminians, concerning theſe intricate points, were comprehended in *five articles.* They held,

" 1. That God, from all eternity, determined
" to beſtow ſalvation on thoſe whom he foreſaw
" would perſevere unto the end in their faith in
" CHRIST JESUS; and to inflict everlaſting puniſh-
" ments on thoſe who ſhould continue in their
" unbelief, and reſiſt, unto the end, his divine
" ſuccours:

" 2. That JESUS CHRIST, by his death and
" ſufferings, made an atonement for the ſins of all
" mankind in general, and of every individual in
" particular:—that, however, none but thoſe who
" believe in him can be partakers of their divine
" benefit.

" 3. That *true faith* cannot proceed from the
" exerciſe of our natural faculties and powers, nor
" from the force and operation of free-will; ſince
" man, in conſequence of his natural corruption,
" is incapable either of thinking or doing any
" good thing; and that therefore it is neceſſary
" to his converſion and ſalvation, that he be *re-*
" *generated* and renewed by the operation of the
" Holy Ghoſt, which is the gift of God, through
" JESUS CHRIST.

"4. That this *Divine Grace*, or energy of the "Holy Ghoſt, which heals the diſorder of a corrupt nature, begins, advances, and brings to "perfection every thing that can be called *good* "in man; and that, conſequently, all good "works, without exception, are to be attributed "to God alone, and to the operation of his "grace; that, nevertheleſs, this grace does not "*force* the man to act againſt his inclination, but "may be *reſiſted* and rendered *ineffectual* by the "perverſe will of the impenitent ſinner.

"5. That they who are united to CHRIST by "faith are thereby furniſhed with abundant "ſtrength, and with ſuccours ſufficient to enable "them to triumph over the ſeduction of Satan, "and the allurements of ſin and temptation; "but that the queſtion, *Whether ſuch* MAY *fall* "*from their faith, and forfeit finally this ſtate of* "*grace?* has not been yet reſolved with ſufficient "perſpicuity; and muſt, therefore, be yet more "carefully examined by an attentive ſtudy of "what the holy Scriptures have declared in re"lation to this important point."

It is to be obſerved, that this laſt article was afterwards changed by the Arminians, who, in proceſs of time, declared their ſentiments with leſs caution, and poſitively affirmed, that *the ſaints might fall from a ſtate of grace* [g].

If we are to judge of men's ſentiments by their words and declarations, the tenets of the Arminians, at the period of time now under conſideration, bear a manifeſt reſemblance of the Lutheran ſyſtem. But the Calviniſts did not judge in this manner; on the contrary, they explained the words and declarations of the Arminians according to the notions they had formed of their hidden ſentiments; and, inſtead of judging of their opinions by their expreſſions, they judged of their expreſſions by their opinions. They maintained, that the Arminians deſigned, under theſe ſpecious and artful declarations, to inſinuate the poiſon of Socinianiſm and Pelagianiſm into unwary and uninſtructed minds. The ſecret thoughts of men are only known to Him, who is the ſearcher of hearts; and it is his privilege alone to pronounce judgment upon thoſe intentions and deſigns that are concealed from public view. But if we were allowed to interpret the *five articles*, now mentioned in a ſenſe conformable to what the leading doctors among the Arminians have taught in later times concerning theſe points, it would be difficult to ſhew, that the ſuſpicions of the Calviniſts were entirely groundleſs. For it is certain, whatever the Arminians may allege to the contrary, that the ſentiments of their moſt eminent theological writers, after the ſynod of *Dort*, concerning Divine Grace, and the other doctrines that are connected with it, approached much nearer to the opinions of the Pelagians and Semi-pelagians, than to thoſe of the Lutheran church [*b*].

---

[g] The hiſtory of theſe *Five Articles*, and more particularly of their reception and progreſs in *England*, has been written by Dr. HEYLIN, whoſe book was tranſlated into Dutch by the learned and eloquent BRANDT, and publiſhed at *Rotterdam* in the year 1687.

Prince Maurice declares againſt the Arminians.

V. The mild and favourable treatment the Arminians received from the magiſtrates of *Holland*, and from ſeveral perſons of merit and diſtinction, encouraged

---

☞ [*b*] This is a curious remark. It would ſeem as if the Lutherans were not Semi-pelagians; as if they conſidered man as abſolutely *paſſive* in the work of his converſion and ſanctification; but ſuch an opinion ſurely has never been the general doctrine of the Lutheran church, however rigorouſly LUTHER may have expreſſed himſelf on that head in ſome unguarded moments; more eſpecially it may be affirmed, that in later times the Lutherans are, to a man, Semi-pelagians; and let it not be thought, that this is imputed to them as a reproach.

encouraged them to hope, that their affairs would take a proſperous turn, or at leaſt that their cauſe was not deſperate, when an unexpected and ſudden ſtorm aroſe againſt them, and blaſted their expectations. This change was owing to cauſes entirely foreign to religion; and its origin muſt be ſought for in thoſe connexions, which can ſcarcely be admitted as poſſible by the philoſopher, but are perpetually preſented to the view of the hiſtorian. A ſecret miſunderſtanding had for ſome time ſubſiſted between the Stadtholder MAURICE, prince of *Orange*, and ſome of the principal magiſtrates and miniſters of the new republic, ſuch as OLDENBARNEVELDT, GROTIUS, and HOOGERBEETS; and this miſunderſtanding had at length broke out into an open enmity and diſcord. The views of this great prince are differently repreſented by different hiſtorians. Some allege, that he had formed the deſign of getting himſelf declared count of *Holland*, a dignity which WILLIAM I., the glorious founder of Belgic liberty, is alſo ſaid to have had in view [i]. Others affirm, that he only aſpired after a greater degree of authority and influence than ſeemed conſiſtent with the liberties of the republic; it is at leaſt certain, that ſome of the principal perſons in the government ſuſpected him of aiming at ſupreme dominion. The leading men above-mentioned oppoſed theſe deſigns; and theſe leading men were the patrons of the Arminians. The *Arminians* adhered to theſe their patrons and defenders, without whoſe aid they could have no proſpect of ſecurity or protection. Their adverſaries the *Gomariſts*, on the contrary, ſeconded the views, and eſpouſed the intereſts of the prince; and inflamed his reſentment, which had been already more or leſs kindled by various ſuggeſtions, to the diſadvantage of the Arminians, and of thoſe who protected them. Thus, after mutual ſuſpicions and diſcontents, the flame broke out with violence; and MAURICE reſolved the downfal of thoſe who ruled the republic, without ſhewing a proper regard to his counſels; and alſo of the Arminians, who eſpouſed their cauſe. The leading men, that ſat at the helm of government, were caſt into priſon. OLDENBARNEVELDT, a man of gravity and wiſdom, whoſe hairs were grown grey in the ſervice of his country, loſt his life on a public ſcaffold; while GROTIUS and HOOGERBEETS were condemned to a perpetual priſon [k], under what pretext, or in conſequence of

---

[i] That MAURICE aimed at the dignity of Count of *Holland*, we learn from AUBERY's *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de Hollande et des autres Provinces Unies*, ſect. ii. p. 216. *Ed. Paris*. If we are to believe AUBERY (informed by his father, who was, at that time, ambaſſador of *France* at the *Hague*), OLDENBARNEVELDT diſapproved of this deſign, prevented its execution, and loſt his life by his bold oppoſition to the views of the prince. This account is looked upon as erroneous by LE VASSOR, who takes much pains to refute it, and indeed with ſucceſs, in his *Hiſtoire de* LOUIS XIII., tom. ii. p. ii. p. 123. LE CLERK, in his *Biblioth. Choiſie*, tom. ii. p. 134, and in his *Hiſtory of the United Provinces*, endeavours to confirm what is related by AUBERY; and alſo affirms, that the project, formed by MAURICE, had been formed before by his father. The determination of this debated point is not neceſſary to our preſent purpoſe. It is ſufficient to obſerve, what is acknowledged on all ſides, that OLDENBARNEVELDT and his aſſociates ſuſpected Prince MAURICE of a deſign to encroach

---

encroach upon the liberties of the republic, and to arrogate to himſelf the ſupreme dominion. Hence the zeal of BARNEVELDT to weaken his influence and to ſet bounds to his authority; hence the indignation and reſentment of MAURICE; and hence the downfal of the Arminian ſect, which enjoyed the patronage, and adhered to the intereſts, of OLDENBARNEVELDT and GROTIUS.

[k] The truth of this general account of theſe unhappy diviſions will undoubtedly be acknowledged by all parties, particularly at this period of time, when theſe tumults and commotions have ſubſided, and the ſpirit of party is leſs blind, partial,

of what accuſations or crimes, is unknown to us [l]. As the Arminians were not charged with any

---

partial and violent. And the candid and ingenuous Calviniſts who acknowledge this, will not thereby do the ſmalleſt prejudice to their cauſe. For ſhould they even grant (what I neither pretend to affirm nor deny) that their anceſtors, carried away by the impetuous ſpirit of the times, defended their religious opinions in a manner that was far from being conſiſtent with the dictates of moderation and prudence, no rational concluſion can be drawn from this, either againſt them or the goodneſs of their cauſe. For it is well known, both by obſervation and experience, that unjuſtifiable things have often been done by men, whoſe characters and intentions, in the general, were good and upright; and that a good cauſe has frequently been maintained by methods that would not bear a rigorous examination. What I have ſaid with brevity on this ſubject is confirmed and amplified by LE CLERC, in his *Hiſtoire des Provinces Unies*, and the *Biblioth. Choiſie*, tom. ii. p. 134. and alſo by GROTIUS, in his *Apologeticus eorum, qui Hollandiæ et Weſtfriſiæ, et vicinis quibuſdam nationibus præfuerant ante mutationem quæ evenit*, An. 1618. The life of OLDENBARNEVELDT, written in Dutch, was publiſhed at the *Hague* in 4to. in the year 1648. The hiſtory of his trial, and of the judgment pronounced on the famous triumvirate, mentioned above, was drawn by GERARD BRANDT, from authentic records, and publiſhed under the following title: *Hiſtoire van de Rechtſpleginge gehouden in den jgaren* 1618 *et* 1619, *omtrent de drie gevangene Heeren* JOHANN VAN OLDENBARNEVELDT, ROMBOUT HOOGERBEETS, *en* HUGO DE GROOT; a third edition of this book, augmented with Annotations, was publiſhed in 4to. at *Rotterdam*, in the year 1723. The *Hiſtory of the Life and Actions of* GROTIUS, compoſed in Dutch by CASPAR BRANDT and ADRIAN VAN CATTENBURGH, and drawn moſtly from original papers, caſts a conſiderable degree of light on the hiſtory of the tranſactions now before us. This famous work was publiſhed in the year 1727, in two volumes in folio, at *Dort* and *Amſterdam*, under the following title: *Hiſtoire van het leven des Heeron* HUIG DE GROOT, *beſchreven tot den Anfang van zyn Geſandchap wegens de Koninginne en Kroone van Zweden aanit Hof van Vrankryck door* CASPARD BRANDT, *en vervolgt tot zyn dood door* ADRIAN VAN CATTENBURGH. Thoſe who deſire to form a true and accurate notion of the character and conduct of GROTIUS, and to ſee him as it were near hand, muſt have recourſe to this excellent work; ſince all the other accounts of this great man are inſipid, lifeleſs, and exhibit little elſe than a poor ſhadow, in-any violation of the laws, but merely with departing from the eſtabliſhed religion, their cauſe was not of ſuch a nature as rendered it cognizable by a civil tribunal. That, however, this cauſe might be regularly condemned, it was judged proper to bring it before an eccleſiaſtical aſſembly or national ſynod. This method of proceeding was agreeable to the ſentiments and principles of the Calviniſts, who are of opinion that all ſpiritual concerns and religious controverſies ought to be judged and decided by an eccleſiaſtical aſſembly or council [m].

ſtead of a real and animated ſubſtance. The life of GROTIUS, compoſed by BURIGNI in French, and publiſhed ſucceſſively at *Paris* and *Amſterdam*, in two volumes in 8vo, deſerves perhaps to be included in this general cenſure; it is at leaſt a very indifferent and ſuperficial performance. ☞ There appeared in *Holland* a warm vindication of the memory of this great man, in a work publiſhed at *Delft*, in 1727, and entitled, *Grotii Manes ab iniquis obtrectationibus vindicati; accedit ſcriptorum ejus, tum editorum tum ineditorum, Conſpectus Triplex.* See the following note.

☞ [l] Dr. MOSHEIM, however impartial, ſeems to have conſulted more the authors of one ſide than of the other; probably becauſe they are more numerous, and more univerſally known. When he publiſhed this hiſtory, the world was not favoured with the *Letters, Memoirs, and Negotiations of Sir* DUDLEY CARLETON: which Lord ROYSTON (now Earl of HARDWICK) drew forth ſome years ago from his ineſtimable treaſure of hiſtorical manuſcripts, and preſented to the public, or rather at firſt to a ſelect number of perſons, to whom he diſtributed a ſmall number of copies of theſe *Negotiations*, printed at his own expence. They were ſoon tranſlated both into Dutch and French; and, though it cannot be affirmed, that the ſpirit of party is no where diſcoverable in them, yet they contain anecdotes with reſpect both to OLDENBARNEVELDT and GROTIUS, that the Arminians, and the other patrons of theſe two great men, have been ſtudious to conceal. Theſe anecdotes, though they may not be at all ſufficient to juſtify the ſeverities exerciſed againſt theſe eminent men, would, however, have prevented Dr. MOSHEIM from ſaying, that he knew not under what pretext they were arreſted.

☞ [m] The Calviniſts are not particular in this; and indeed it is natural that debates, purely theological, ſhould be diſcuſſed in an aſſembly of Divines.

VI. Accordingly

The ſynod of *Dort.*

VI. Accordingly a ſynod was convoked at *Dort*, in the year 1618, by the counſels and influence of prince MAURICE [*n*], at which were preſent eccleſiaſtical deputies from the United Provinces, as alſo from the churches of *England*, *Heſſia*, *Bremen*, *Switzerland*, and the *Palatinate*. The leading men among the Arminians appeared before this famous aſſembly, to defend their cauſe; and they had at their head, SIMON EPISCOPIUS, who was, at that time, profeſſor of divinity at *Leyden*, had formerly been the diſciple of ARMINIUS, and was admired, even by his enemies, on account of the depth of his judgment, the extent of his learning, and the force of his eloquence. This eminent man addreſſed a diſcourſe, full of moderation, gravity, and elocution, to the aſſembled divines; but this was no ſooner finiſhed, than difficulties aroſe, which prevented the *conference* the Arminians had demanded, in order to ſhew the grounds, in reaſon and ſcripture, on which their opinions were founded. The Arminian deputies propoſed to begin the defence of their cauſe by refuting the opinions of the Calviniſts their adverſaries. This propoſal was rejected by the ſynod, which looked upon the Arminians as a ſet of men that lay under the charge of hereſy; and therefore thought it incumbent upon them firſt to declare and prove their own opinions, before

---

☞ [*n*] Our author always forgets to mention the order, iſſued out by the States-general, for the convocation of this famous ſynod; and by his manner of expreſſing himſelf, and particularly by the phraſe (MAURITIO *auctore*), would ſeem to inſinuate, that it was by the prince that this aſſembly was called together. The legitimacy of the manner of convoking this ſynod was queſtioned by OLDENBARNEVELDT, who maintained that the States-general had no ſort of authority in matters of religion, not even the power of aſſembling a ſynod; affirming that this was an act of ſovereignty, that belonged to each province ſeparately and reſpectively. See CARLETON's *Letters*, &c.

they could be allowed to combat the ſentiments of others. The deſign of the Arminians, in the propoſal they made, was probably to get the people on their ſide, by ſuch an unfavourable repreſentation of the Calviniſtical ſyſtem, and of the harſh conſequences, that ſeem deducible from it, as might excite a diſguſt, in the minds of thoſe that were preſent, againſt its patrons and abettors. And it is more than probable, that one of the principal reaſons, that engaged the members of the ſynod to reject this propoſal, was a conſideration of the genius and eloquence of EPISCOPIUS, and an apprehenſion of the effects they might produce upon the multitude. When all the methods employed to perſuade the Arminians to ſubmit to the manner of proceeding, propoſed by the ſynod, proved ineffectual, they were excluded from that aſſembly, and returned home, complaining bitterly of the rigour and partiality with which they had been treated. Their cauſe was nevertheleſs tried in their abſence, and, in conſequence of a ſtrict examination of their writings, they were pronounced guilty of peſtilential errors, and condemned as corrupters of the true religion. This ſentence was followed by its natural effects, which were the excommunication of the Arminians, the ſuppreſſion of their religious aſſemblies, and the deprivation of their miniſters. In this unhappy conteſt, the candid and impartial obſerver will eaſily perceive that there were faults committed on both ſides. Which of the contending parties is moſt worthy of cenſure is a point, whoſe diſcuſſion is foreign to our preſent purpoſe [*o*].

VII. We

[*o*] The writers who have given accounts of the ſynod of *Dort* are mentioned by JO. ALBERT. FABRICIUS, in his *Biblioth. Græc.* vol. xi. p. 723. The moſt ample account of this famous aſſembly has been given by BRANDT, in the ſecond and

The judgment that ought to be formed concerning this ſynod.

VII. We ſhall not here appreciate either the merit or demerit of the divines, that were aſſembled in this famous ſynod; but we cannot help obſerving that their ſanctity, wiſdom, and virtue have been exalted beyond all meaſure by the Calviniſts, while their partiality, violence, and their other defects, have been exaggerated with a certain degree of malignity by the Arminians [*p*]. There is no ſort of doubt, but that, among the members of this aſſembly, who ſat in judgment upon the Arminians, there were ſeveral perſons equally diſtinguiſhed by their learning, piety, and integrity, who acted with upright intentions, and had not the leaſt notion, that the ſteps they were taking, or encouraging, were at all inconſiſtent with equity and wiſdom. On the other hand, it appears with the utmoſt evidence, that the Arminians had reaſon to complain of ſeveral circumſtances that ſtrike us in the hiſtory of this remarkable period. It is plain, in the firſt place, that

---

and third volumes of his *Hiſtory of the Reformation in the United Provinces*; but, as this Author is an Arminian, it will not be improper to compare his relation with a work of the learned LEYDEKKER, in which the piety and juſtice of the proceedings of this ſynod are vindicated againſt the cenſures of BRANDT. This work, which is compoſed in Dutch, was publiſhed in two volumes in 4to, at *Amſterdam*, in the years 1705 and 1707, under the following title: *Eere van de Nationale Synode, van Dordrecht voorgeſtaan en beveſtigd tegen de beſchuldingen van* G. BRANDT. After comparing diligently theſe two productions, I could ſee no enormous error in BRANDT; for in truth, theſe two writers do not ſo much differ about facts, as they do in the reaſoning they deduce from them, and in their accounts of the cauſes from whence they proceeded. The reader will do well to conſult the *Letters* of the learned and worthy Mr. JOHN HALES of *Eaton*, who was an impartial ſpectator of the proceedings of this famous ſynod, and who relates with candour and ſimplicity what he ſaw and heard.

[*p*] All that appeared unfair to the Arminians in the proceedings of this ſynod, has been collected together in a Dutch book, entitled, *Nulliteten, Miſhandelingen, ende anbyllike Procedurin, des Nationalen Synodi gehouden binnen Dordrecht*, &c.

the ruin of their community was a point not only premeditated, but determined even before the meeting of the national ſynod [q]; and that this ſynod was not ſo much aſſembled to examine the doctrine of the Arminians, in order to ſee whether it was worthy of toleration and indulgence, as to publiſh and execute, with a certain ſolemnity, with an air of juſtice, and with the ſuffrage and conſent of foreign divines, whoſe authority was reſpectable, a ſentence already drawn up and agreed upon by thoſe who had the principal direction in theſe affairs. It is further to be obſerved, that the accuſers and adverſaries of the Arminians were their judges, and that BOGERMAN, who preſided in this famous ſynod, was diſtinguiſhed by his peculiar hatred of that ſect; that neither the Dutch nor foreign divines had the liberty of giving their ſuffrage according to their own private ſentiments, but were obliged to deliver the opinions of the princes and magiſtrates, of whoſe orders they were the depoſitaries [r]; that the influence of the lay deputies, who appeared in the ſynod with commiſſions from the States-general and the prince of *Orange*, was ſtill ſuperior to that of the eccleſiaſtical members, who ſat as judges; and, laſtly, that the ſolemn promiſe, made to the Arminians, when they were ſummoned before the ſynod, that *they ſhould be allowed the freedom of explaining and defending their opinions,*

☞ [q] This aſſertion is of too weighty a nature to be advanced without ſufficient proof. Our author quotes no authority for it.

☞ [r] Here our author has fallen into a palpable miſtake. The Dutch divines had no commiſſion but from their reſpective conſiſtories, or ſubordinate eccleſiaſtical aſſemblies; nor are they ever depoſitaries of the orders of their magiſtrates, who have lay-deputies to repreſent them both in provincial and national ſynods. As to the Engliſh and other foreign doctors that appeared in the ſynod of *Dort*, the caſe perhaps may have been ſomewhat different.

opinions, as far as they thought proper, or neceſſary to their juſtification, was manifeſtly violated [t].

The fate of the Arminians after the ſynod of *Dort.*

VIII. The Arminians, in conſequence of the deciſion of the ſynod, were conſidered as enemies of their country and of its eſtabliſhed religion; and they were accordingly treated with great ſeverity. They were deprived of all their poſts and employments, whether eccleſiaſtical or civil; and, which they looked upon as a yet more intolerable inſtance of the rigour of their adverſaries, their miniſters were ſilenced, and their congregations were ſuppreſſed. They refuſed obedience to the order, by which their paſtors were prohibited from performing, in public, their miniſterial functions; and thus drew upon themſelves anew the reſentment of their ſuperiors, who puniſhed them by fines, impriſonment, exile, and other marks of ignominy. To avoid theſe vexations, many of them retired to *Antwerp*, others fled to *France*; while a conſiderable number, accepting the invitation ſent to them by FREDERICK, duke of *Holſtein*, formed a colony, which ſettled in the dominions of that prince, and built for themſelves a handſome town called *Frederickſtadt*, in the dutchy of *Sleſwyck*, where they ſtill live happy and unmoleſted, in the open profeſſion and free exerciſe of their religion. The heads of this colony were perſons of diſtinction, who had been obliged to leave their native country on account of theſe troubles, particularly ADRIAN VANDER WAEL, who was the firſt governor of the new city [u]. Among the perſecuted eccleſiaſtics, who followed this colony, were, the famous VORSTIUS, who, by his religious ſentiments, which differed but little from the Socinian ſyſtem, had rendered the Arminians particularly odious, GREVINCKHOVIUS, a man of a reſolute ſpirit, who had been paſtor at *Rotterdam*, GOULART, GREVIUS, WALTERS, NARSIUS, and others [*w*].

---

[t] See LE VASSOR, *Hiſtoire du Regne de* LOUIS XIII. tom. iii. livr. xii. p. 365, 366.—and MOSHEIM's Preface to the Latin tranſlation of HALE's account of the ſynod of *Dort*, p. 394—400.

[u] The hiſtory of this colony is accurately related in the famous letters publiſhed by PHILIP LIMBORCH and CHRIST-

They are recalled from exile.

IX. After the death of Prince MAURICE, which happened in the year 1625, the Arminian exiles experienced the mildneſs and clemency of his brother and ſucceſſor FREDERIC HENRY, under whoſe adminiſtration they were recalled from baniſhment, and reſtored to their former reputation and tranquillity. Thoſe who had taken refuge in the kingdom of *France* and in the Spaniſh *Netherlands*, were the firſt that embraced this occaſion of returning to their native country, where they erected churches in ſeveral places, and more particularly in the cities of *Amſterdam* and *Rotterdam*, under the mild ſhade of a religious toleration. That they might alſo have a public ſeminary of learning for the inſtruction of their youth, and the propagation of their theological principles, they founded a college at *Amſterdam*, in which two profeſſors were appointed to inſtruct the candidates for the miniſtry, in the various branches of literature and ſcience, ſacred and profane. SIMON EPISCOPIUS was the firſt profeſſor of theology among the Arminians; and ſince his time, the ſeminary now mentioned has

---

IAN HARTSOEKER, entitled, *Epiſtolæ præſtantium et eruditorum virorum Eccleſiaſticæ et Theologicæ*, of which the laſt edition was publiſhed in folio at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1704.—See alſo JO. MOLLERI *Introductio in Hiſtor. Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ*, p. ii. p. 108:—and PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Eccleſiæ Danicæ Diplomatici*, tom. iii. p. 714.

[*w*] For an ample account of VORSTIUS, ſee JO. MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 931. as alſo p. 242. 247. 249. 255. 576. where we find a particular account of the other eccleſiaſtics above mentioned.

been, generally ſpeaking, furniſhed with profeſſors eminent for their learning and genius, ſuch as COURCELLES, POELENBURG, LIMBORCH, LE CLERC, CATTENBURGH [x], and WETSTEIN.

The ancient and modern ſyſtem of Arminianiſm.

X. We have already ſeen, that the original difference between the Arminians and the Calviniſts was entirely confined to the *five points* mentioned above, relative to the doctrines of Predeſtination and Grace; and it was the doctrine of the *former* concerning theſe points alone that occaſioned their condemnation in the ſynod of *Dort*. It is further to be obſerved, that theſe five points, as explained at that time by the Arminians, ſeemed to differ very little from the Lutheran ſyſtem. But after the ſynod of *Dort*, and more eſpecially after the return of the Arminian exiles into their native country, the theological ſyſtem of this community underwent a remarkable change, and aſſumed an aſpect, that diſtinguiſhed it entirely from that of all other Chriſtian churches. For then they gave a new explication of theſe *five articles*, that made them almoſt coincide with the doctrine of thoſe who deny the neceſſity of divine ſuccours in the work of converſion and in the paths of virtue. Nay, they went ſtill further, and, bringing the greateſt part of the doctrines of Chriſtianity before the tribunal of reaſon, they modified them conſiderably, and reduced them to an exceſſive degree of ſimplicity. ARMINIUS, the parent and founder of the community, was, undoubtedly, the inventor of this new form of doctrine, and taught it to his diſciples [y]; but it was firſt digeſted into a regular ſyſtem, and embelliſhed with the charms of a maſculine eloquence, by Episcopius, whoſe learning and genius have given him a place among the Arminian doctors, next to their founder [z].

---

[x] There is an accurate account of theſe and the other Arminian writers given by ADRIAN VAN CATTENBURGH, in his *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Remonſtrantium*, printed in 8vo at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1728.

[y] It is a common opinion that the ancient Arminians, who flouriſhed before the ſynod of *Dort*, were much more ſound

XI. The

---

found in their opinions, and ſtrict in their morals, than thoſe who have lived after this period; that Arminius himſelf only rejected the Calviniſtical doctrine of abſolute decrees, and what he took to be its immediate conſequences, adopting in all other points the doctrines received in the Reformed churches; but that his diſciples, and more eſpecially Episcopius, had boldly tranſgreſſed the bounds that had been wiſely preſcribed by their maſter, and had gone over to the Pelagians, and even to the Socinians. Such, I ſay, is the opinion commonly entertained concerning this matter. But it appears, on the contrary, evident to me, that Arminius himſelf had laid the plan of that theological ſyſtem, that was, in after-times, embraced by his followers, and that he had inſtilled the main principles of it into the minds of his diſciples; and that theſe latter, and particularly Episcopius, did really no more than bring this plan to a greater degree of perfection, and propagate, with more courage and perſpicuity, the doctrines it contained. I have the teſtimony of Arminius to ſupport this notion, beſides many others that might be alleged in its behalf; for, in the *laſt will* made by this eminent man, a little before his death, he plainly and poſitively declares, that the great object he had in view, in all his theological and miniſterial labours, was to unite in one community, cemented by the bonds of fraternal charity, all ſects and denominations of Chriſtians, the papiſts excepted; his words, as they are recorded in the funeral oration, which was compoſed on occaſion of his death by Bertius, are as follow: *Ea propoſui et docui . . . . quæ ad propagationem amplificationemque veritatis religionis Chriſtianæ, veri Dei cultus, communis pietatis, et ſanctæ inter homines converſationis, denique ad* CONVENIENTEM CHRISTIANO NOMINI TRANQUILLITATEM ET PACEM *juxta verbum Dei* POSSENT CONFERRE, EXCLUDENS EX IIS PAPATUM, *cum quo nulla unitas fidei, nullum pietatis aut Chriſtianæ pacis vinculum ſervari poteſt.* Theſe words, in their amount, coincide perfectly with the modern ſyſtem of Arminianiſm, which extends the limits of the Chriſtian church, and relaxes the bonds of fraternal communion in ſuch a manner, that Chriſtians of all ſects and all denominations, whatever their ſentiments and opinions may be (papiſts excepted), may be formed into one religious body, and live together in brotherly love and concord.

[z] The life of this eminent man was compoſed in Latin by the learned and judicious Limborch, and is ſingularly worthy

The great end propoſed by the Arminian ſyſtem, and its principal heads.

XI. The great and ultimate end the Arminians ſeem to have in view, is, that Chriſtians, though divided in their opinions, may be united in fraternal charity and love, and thus be formed into one family or community, notwithſtanding the diverſity of their theological ſentiments. In order to execute their benevolent purpoſe, they maintain, that CHRIST demands from his ſervants more *virtue* than *faith*; that he has confined that belief which is eſſential to ſalvation to a few articles; that, on the other hand, the rules of practice he has preſcribed are extremely large in their extent; and that charity and virtue ought to be the principal ſtudy of true Chriſtians. Their definition of a true Chriſtian is ſomewhat latitudinarian in point of belief. According to their account of things, every perſon is a genuine ſubject of the kingdom of CHRIST, "1. Who receives the holy Scriptures, and more eſpecially "the New Teſtament, as the rule of his faith, "however he may think proper to interpret and "explain theſe ſacred oracles; 2. Who abſtains "from idolatry and polytheiſm, with all their "concomitant abſurdities; 3. Who leads a decent, honeſt, and virtuous life, directed and "regulated by the laws of God; and, 4. Who "never diſcovers a ſpirit of perſecution, diſcord, "or ill-will towards thoſe who differ from him in "their religious ſentiments, or, in their manner "of interpreting the holy Scriptures." Thus the wide boſom of the Arminian church is opened to all who profeſs themſelves Chriſtians, however eſſentially they may differ from each other in their theological opinions. The papiſts alone are excluded from this extenſive communion, and this

---

worthy of an attentive peruſal. It was publiſhed at *Amſterdam* in 8vo in the year 1701.

becauſe they eſteem it lawful [a] to perſecute thoſe who will not ſubmit to the yoke of the Roman pontif [b]. It is not our deſign here either to juſtify or condemn theſe latitudinarian terms of communion; it is true, indeed, that, if other Chriſtian churches adopted them, diverſity of ſentiments would be no longer an obſtacle to mutual love and concord.

☞ [a] It is not only on account of their *perſecuting ſpirit*, but alſo on account of their *idolatrous worſhip*, that the Arminians exclude the papiſts from their communion. See the following note.

[b] For a full and accurate repreſentation of this matter, the reader need ſcarcely have recourſe to any other treatiſe than that which is publiſhed in the firſt volume of the works of EPISCOPIUS (p. 508.), under the following title: *Verus Theologus Remonſtrans, ſive veræ Remonſtrantium Theologiæ de errantibus dilucida declaratio*. This treatiſe is written with preciſion and perſpicuity. LE CLERC, in the *Dedication* prefixed to his Latin tranſlation of Dr. HAMMOND's *Paraphraſe and Commentary on the New Teſtament*, gives a brief account of the Arminian principles and terms of communion in the following words, addreſſed to the learned men of that ſect: *You declare*, ſays he, *that they* ONLY *are excluded from your communion, who are chargeable with idolatry—who do not receive the holy Scriptures as the rule of faith—who trample upon the precepts of* CHRIST *by their licentious manners and actions—and who perſecute thoſe who differ from them in matters of religion* *. Many writers affirm, that the Arminians acknowledge as their brethren all thoſe who receive that form of doctrine that is known under the denomination of the *Apoſtles Creed*. But that theſe writers are miſtaken, appears ſufficiently from what has been already ſaid on this ſubject; and is further confirmed by the expreſs teſtimony of LE CLERC, who (in his *Biblioth. Ancienne et Mod.* tom. xxv. p. 110.) declares, that it is not true that the Arminians admit to their communion all thoſe who receive the *Apoſtles Creed*; his words are, *Ils ſe trompent*; *ils* (the Arminians) *offrent la communion à tous ceux, qui reçoivent l'ecriture ſainte comme la ſeule regle de la foi et des mœurs, et qui ne ſont ni idolatres ni perſecuteurs*.

* The original words of LE CLERC are, *Profiteri ſoletis . . . eos duntaxat a vobis excludi, qui* (1) *idolatoria ſunt contaminati*, (2) *qui minime habent ſcripturam pro fidei norma*, (3) *qui impuris moribus ſancta Chriſti præcepta conculcant*, (4) *aut qui denique aliis religionis cauſa vexant*.

The Arminian Confeſſion of Faith.

XII. From all this it appears plain enough, that the Arminian community was a kind of *medley*, compoſed of perſons of different principles, and that, properly ſpeaking, it could have no fixed and ſtable form or ſyſtem of doctrine. The Arminians, however, foreſeeing that this circumſtance might be objected to them as a matter of reproach, and unwilling to paſs for a ſociety connected by no common principles or bond of union, have adopted, as their *Confeſſion of Faith*, a kind of theological ſyſtem, drawn up by EPISCOPIUS, and expreſſed, for the moſt part, in the words and phraſes of holy Scripture [*c*]. But as none of their paſtors are obliged, either by oath, declaration, or tacit compact, to adhere ſtrictly to this confeſſion, and as, on the contrary, by the fundamental conſtitution of this community, every one is authorized to interpret its expreſſions (which are in effect ſuſceptible of various ſignifications) in a manner conformable to their peculiar ſentiments; it evidently follows, that we cannot deduce from thence an accurate and conſiſtent view of Arminianiſm, or know, with any degree of certainty, what doctrines are adopted or rejected by this ſect. Hence it happens, that the Arminian doctors differ widely among themſelves concerning ſome of the moſt important doctrines of Chriſtianity [*d*]; nor are they univerſally agreed or entirely uniform in their ſentiments of almoſt any one point, if we except the doctrines of Predeſtination and Grace. They all, indeed, unanimouſly adhere to the doctrine that excluded their anceſtors from the communion of the Reformed churches, even *that the love of God extends itſelf equally to all mankind*; *that no mortal is rendered finally unhappy by an eternal and invincible decree*; *and that the miſery of thoſe that periſh comes from themſelves*; but they explain this doctrine in a very different manner from that in which it was formerly underſtood. Be that as it may, this is the fundamental doctrine of the Arminians, and whoever oppoſes it, becomes thereby an adverſary to the whole community; whereas thoſe, whoſe objections are levelled at particular tenets which are found in the writings of the Arminian divines, cannot be ſaid, with any degree of propriety, to attack or cenſure the Arminian church, whoſe theological ſyſtem, a few articles excepted, is vague and uncertain [e], and is not characterized by any fixed ſet of doctrines and principles. Such only attack certain doctors of that communion, who are divided among themſelves, and do not agree, even in their explications of the doctrine relating to the extent of the divine love and mercy; though this be the fundamental point that occaſioned their ſeparation from the Reformed churches.

[*c*] This Confeſſion of Faith is extant in Latin, Dutch, and German. The Latin edition of it is to be found in the works of EPISCOPIUS, tom. ii. p. ii. p. 69—Where may be found alſo a *Defence* of this *Confeſſion* againſt the objection of the profeſſors of divinity at *Leyden*.

[*d*] They who will be at the pains of comparing together the theological writings of EPISCOPIUS, COURCELLES, LIMBORCH, LE CLERC, and CATTENBURGH, will ſee clearly, the diverſity of ſentiments that reigns among the Arminian doctors.

The preſent ſtate of Arminianiſm.

XIII. The Arminian church makes at preſent but an inconſiderable figure, when compared with the Reformed; and, if credit may be given to public report, it declines from day to day. The

---

☞ [e] What renders the Arminian *Confeſſion of Faith* an uncertain repreſentation of the ſentiments of the community, is, the liberty in which every paſtor is indulged of departing from it, when he finds any of its doctrines in contradiction with his private opinions. See the *Introduction to the Arminian Confeſſion of Faith*, in the third volume of the French abridgment of BRANDT's *Hiſtory of the Reformation of the Netherlands*.

Arminians have ſtill in the *United Provinces* thirty-four congregations, more or leſs numerous, which are furniſhed with eighty-four paſtors; beſides theſe, their church at *Frederickſtadt*, in the dutchy of *Holſtein*, ſtill ſubſiſts. It cannot however be ſaid, that the credit and influence of their religious principles have declined with the external luſtre of their community; ſince it is well known, that their ſentiments were early adopted in ſeveral countries, and were ſecretly received by many who had not the courage to profeſs them openly. Every one is acquainted with the change that has taken place in the eſtabliſhed church of *England*, whoſe clergy, generally ſpeaking, ſince the time of Archbiſhop LAUD, have embraced the Arminian doctrine concerning Predeſtination and Grace; and, ſince the reſtoration of CHARLES II., have diſcovered a ſtrong propenſity to many other tenets of the Arminian church. Beſides this, whoever has any acquaintance with the world, muſt know, that, in many of the courts of Proteſtant princes, and, generally ſpeaking, among thoſe perſons that pretend to be wiſer than the multitude, the following fundamental principle of Arminianiſm is adopted: "That thoſe "doctrines, whoſe belief is neceſſary to ſalvation, "are very few in number; and that every one is to "be left at full liberty, with reſpect to his private "ſentiments of God and religion, provided his "life and actions be conformable to the rules of "piety and virtue." Even the *United Provinces*, which ſaw within their boſom the defeat of Arminianiſm, are at this time ſenſible of a conſiderable change in that reſpect; for while the patrons of Calviniſm in that republic acknowledge, that the community, which makes an external profeſſion of Arminianiſm, declines gradually both in its numbers and influence, they, at the ſame time, complain, that its doctrines and ſpirit gain ground from day to day; that they have even inſinuated themſelves more or leſs into the boſom of the eſtabliſhed church, and infected the theological ſyſtem of many of thoſe very paſtors who are appointed to maintain the doctrine and authority of the ſynod of *Dort.* The progreſs of Arminianiſm in other countries is abundantly known; and its votaries in *France*, *Geneva*, and many parts of *Switzerland*, are certainly very numerous [ee].

The

☞ [ee] It may not however be improper to obſerve here, that the progreſs of *Arminianiſm* has been greatly retarded, nay, that its cauſe daily declines in *Germany* and ſeveral parts of *Switzerland*, in conſequence of the aſcendant which the Leibnitian and Wolfian philoſophy hath gained in theſe countries, and particularly among the clergy and men of learning. LEIBNITZ and WOLF, by attacking that liberty *of indifference*, which is ſuppoſed to imply the power of acting not only *without*, but *againſt* motives, ſtruck at the very foundation of the *Arminian* ſyſtem. But this was not all: for, by conſidering that multiplicity of worlds that compoſe the univerſe, as one *Syſtem* or *Whole*, whoſe greateſt poſſible *perfection* is the ULTIMATE END of creating goodneſs, and the ſovereign purpoſe of governing wiſdom, they removed from the doctrine of *Predeſtination* thoſe arbitrary procedures and narrow views, with which the Calviniſts are ſuppoſed to have loaded it, and gave it a new, a more pleaſing, and a more philoſophical aſpect. As the Leibnitians laid down this great END, as the ſupreme object of God's univerſal dominion, and the ſcope to which *all* his diſpenſations are directed, ſo they concluded, that, if this *end* was propoſed, it *muſt* be accompliſhed. Hence the doctrine of neceſſity, to fulfil the purpoſes of a Predeſtination founded in wiſdom and goodneſs: a neceſſity, *phyſical* and *mechanical* in the motions of material and inanimate things, but a neceſſity, *moral* and *ſpiritual* in the voluntary determinations of intelligent beings, in conſequence of prepollent motives, which produce their effects with *certainty*, though theſe effects be *contingent*, and by no means the offspring of an abſolute and eſſentially immutable fatality. Theſe principles are evidently applicable to the main doctrines of Calviniſm; by them *Predeſtination* is confirmed, though modified with reſpect to its reaſons and its ends; by them *Irreſiſtible Grace* (irreſiſtible in a *moral ſenſe)* is maintained upon the hypotheſis of prepollent motives and a moral neceſſity. The *perſeverance of the Saints* is alſo explicable upon the ſame ſyſtem, by a ſeries of moral cauſes producing a ſeries of moral effects. In conſequence

of

The external forms of divine worſhip and eccleſiaſtical government in the Arminian church are almoſt the ſame with thoſe that are in uſe among the *Preſbyterians*. As, however, the leading men among the Arminians are peculiarly ambitious of maintaining their correſpondence and fraternal intercourſe with the church of *England*, and leave no circumſtance unimproved that may tend to confirm this union; ſo they diſcover, upon all occaſions, their approbation of the epiſcopal form of eccleſiaſtical government, and profeſs to regard it as moſt ancient, as truly ſacred, and as ſuperior to all other inſtitutions of church-polity [*f*].

CHAP.

---

of all this, ſeveral divines of the German church have applied the Leibnitian and Wolfian philoſophy to the illuſtration of the doctrines of Chriſtianity; and the learned CANZIUS has written a book expreſsly to ſhew the eminent uſe that may be made of that philoſophy in throwing light upon the chief articles of our faith. See his *Philoſophiæ* Leibnitianæ & Wolfianæ *Uſus in Theologiâ per præcipua fidei capita, auctore* ISRAEL. THEOPH. CANZIO, and of which a *ſecond edition* was publiſhed at Francfort and Leipſic, in 1749. See alſo WITTENBACH'S *Tentamen Theologiæ Dogmaticæ Methodo Scientifica pertractatæ*, which was publiſhed in three vols. 8vo. at *Francfort*, in 1747. See above all, the famous work of LEIBNITZ, entitled, *Eſſais de Théodicée, ſur la Bonté de Dieu, la Liberte de l'homme, & l'origine du mal.*—It is remarkable enough, that the Leibnitian ſyſtem has been embraced by very few, ſcarcely by any, of the Engliſh Calviniſts. Can this be owing to a want of inclination towards philoſophical diſcuſſions? This cannot be ſaid. The ſcheme of *neceſſity* and of *partial evil's tending to univerſal good*, has, indeed, been foſtered in ſome parts of *Great Britain*, and even has turned ſome zealous Arminians into moderate and philoſophical Calviniſts. But the zealous Calviniſts have, for the moſt part, held firm to their theology, and blended no philoſophical principles with their ſyſtem; and it is certain, that the moſt eminent philoſophers have been found, generally ſpeaking, among the Arminians. If both Calviniſts and Arminians claim a KING, it is certain that the latter alone can boaſt of a NEWTON, a LOCKE, a CLARKE, and a BOYLE.

[*f*] Hence, to omit many other circumſtances that ſhew unqueſtionably the truth of this obſervation, the Arminians have

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART II.

CHAPTER IV.

The HISTORY of the Seſt called QUAKERS.

The riſe of the Quakers. George Fox.

THE ſect of QUAKERS received this denomination, in the year 1650, from GERVAS BENNET, Eſq; a juſtice of peace in *Derbyſhire* [g], partly on account of the convulſive agitations and ſhakings of the body with which their diſcourſes to the people were uſually attended, and partly on account of the exhortation addreſſed to this magiſtrate by Fox and his companions, who, when they were called before him, deſired him, with a loud voice and a vehement emotion of body, to *tremble at the word of the Lord*. However ſarcaſtical this appellation may be, when conſidered in its origin, the members of this ſect are willing to adopt it, provided it be rightly underſtood; they prefer, nevertheleſs, to be called, in alluſion to that doctrine that is the fundamental principle of their aſſociation, *Children*, or *Confeſſors of Light*. In their converſation and intercourſe with each other, they uſe no other term of appellation than that of *Friend* [h].

This ſect had its riſe in *England*, in thoſe unhappy times of confuſion, anarchy, and civil diſcord, when every political or religious fanatic, that had formed new plans of government, or invented new ſyſtems of theology, came forth with his novelties to public view, and propagated them with impunity among a fickle and unthinking

---

have been at great pains to repreſent GROTIUS, their hero and their oracle, as a particular admirer of the conſtitution and government of the church of *England*, which he preferred before all other forms of eccleſiaſtical polity. See what LE CLERC has publiſhed on this ſubject at the end of the edition of GROTIUS's book, *De Veritate Religionis Chriſtianæ*, which he gave at the *Hague* in the year 1724, p. 376.

[g] See GEORGE SEWEL's *Hiſtory of the Quakers*, p. 23.—NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. iv. p. 32.

[h] SEWEL, *loc. cit.* p. 624.

multitude. Its parent and founder was GEORGE FOX [i], a ſhoemaker, of a dark and melancholy complexion, and of a viſionary and enthuſiaſtic turn of mind. About the year 1647, which was the twenty-third year of his age, he began to ſtroll through ſeveral counties in *England*, giving himſelf out for a perſon *divinely inſpired*, and ex-

---

☞ [i] The anonymous writer of *A Letter to Dr. Formey, F. R. S.* publiſhed by NICOL, ſeems much offended at Mr. FORMEY on account of his calling GEORGE FOX a man of a *turbulent ſpirit, &c.* He tells us, on the contrary, that, from all the information worthy of credit which he was able to procure, it appears, that Fox "was a man of ſo meek, contented, eaſy, ſteady, and tender a diſpoſition, that it was a "pleaſure to be in his company,—that he exerciſed no authority but over evil, and that every where and in all, but with "love, compaſſion, and long ſuffering." This account he takes from PENN; and it is very probable that he has looked no farther, unleſs it be to the curious portrait which THOMAS ELLWOOD, another Quaker, has given of Fox, a portrait in which there is ſuch an affected jingle of words, as ſhews the author to have been more attentive to the arrangement of his ſentences, than to a true exhibition of the character of his original: for we are told by ELLWOOD, that this ſame GEORGE FOX was deep in divine knowledge, powerful in preaching, fervent in prayer, quick in diſcerning, ſound in judgment *(riſum teneatis, amici)*,—manly in perſonage, grave in geſture, courteous in converſation, weighty in communication, &c. &c. After having thus painted GEORGE after the *fancy* of his two brethren (for fancy is the Quaker's fountain of light and truth), the letter writer obſerves, that Dr. FORMEY has taken his account of George's turbulence and fanaticiſm from MOSHEIM's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.* As MOSHEIM then is dead, and cannot defend himſelf, may I be permitted to beg of this Anonymous Letter-writer, who appears to be a candid and rational man, to caſt an eye upon SEWEL's *Hiſtory of the Quakers*, and to follow this *meek, courteous*, and *modeſt* GEORGE, running like a wild man through ſeveral counties, refuſing homage to his ſovereign, interrupting the miniſters in the public celebration of divine ſervice at *Nottingham, Manſfield,* and *Market Boſworth?* It is remarkable, that the very learned and worthy Dr. HENRY MORE, who was not himſelf without a ſtrong tincture of enthuſiaſm, and who looked upon PENN as a pious Chriſtian, treated nevertheleſs GEORGE FOX as a melancholy fanatic, and as one poſſeſſed with the Devil. See his *Myſt. of Godlineſs*, B. x. ch. 13. As alſo *Schol. in Dialogue*, v. § 5.

Cent. XVII. Sect. II. Part II.

horting the people to attend to the voice of the *divine word*, that lies hid in the hearts of all men. After the execution of Charles I., when all laws both civil and eccleſiaſtical ſeemed to be entirely ſuſpended, if not extinct, Fox exerted his fanatical powers with new vigour, and formed more ambitious and extenſive views. Having acquired a conſiderable number of diſciples of both ſexes, who were ſtrongly infected with his wild enthuſiaſm, he excited great tumults in ſeveral parts of *England*; and, in the year 1650, went ſo far as to diſturb the devotion of thoſe that were aſſembled in the churches for the purpoſes of public worſhip, declaring, that all ſuch aſſemblies were uſeleſs and unchriſtian. For theſe extravagances, both he and his companions were frequently caſt into priſon, and chaſtiſed, as diſturbers of the peace, by the civil magiſtrate [k].

II. The

---

[k] Beſides the ordinary writers of the eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of this century, the curious reader will do well to conſult Croesii *Hiſtoria Quakeriana, Tribus Libris comprehenſa*, the ſecond edition of which was publiſhed in 8vo at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1703. A phyſician named Kolhansius, who was born a Lutheran, but turned Quaker, publiſhed critical remarks upon this hiſtory, under the title of *Dilucidationes*, which were firſt printed at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1696. And it muſt be acknowledged, that there are many inaccuracies in the hiſtory of Croesius; it is, however, much leſs faulty than another hiſtory of this ſect, which was publiſhed at *Cologn*, in 12mo, in the year 1692, under the following title: *Hiſtoire abregeé de la naiſſance et du progres du Kouakeriſme avec celle de ſes dogmes*; for the anonymous author of this latter hiſtory, inſtead of relating well atteſted facts, has compiled, without either diſcernment or choice, ſuch an extravagant medley of truth and falſehood, as is rather adapted to excite laughter than to adminiſter inſtruction. See the ſecond book of Croesius's *Hiſtoria Quakeriana*, p. 322. and 376. as alſo Le Clerc, *Biblioth. Univerſelle et Hiſtorique*, tom. xxii. p. 53.— The moſt ample and authentic account of this ſect is that which was compoſed by George Sewel, from a great variety of genuine records, and partly from the papers of Fox, its founder, and publiſhed under the following title: *The Hiſtory of the Chriſtian people called Quakers*. This work is remarkable both

The firſt attempts of this ſect under Cromwell.

II. The firſt aſſociation of *Quakers* was compoſed moſtly of viſionary fanatics, and of perſons that really ſeemed to be diſordered in their brains; and hence they committed many enormities, which the modern Quakers endeavour to alleviate and diminiſh, but which they neither pretend to juſtify nor to approve. For the greateſt part of them were riotous and tumultuous in the higheſt degree; and even their female diſciples, forgetting the delicacy and decency peculiar to their ſex, bore their part in theſe diſorders. They ran, like Bacchanals, through the towns and villages, declaiming againſt Epiſcopacy, Preſbyterianiſm, and every fixed form of religion; railed at public and ſtated worſhip; affronted and mocked the clergy, even in the very exerciſe of their miniſterial

---

both for the induſtry and accuracy which the author has diſcovered in compiling it. But as SEWEL was himſelf a Quaker, ſo he is ſometimes chargeable with concealing, diminiſhing, or repreſenting under artful colours, many things, which, if impartially related, *muſt* have appeared diſhonourable, and *might* have proved detrimental, to his community. It muſt however be granted, that, notwithſtanding theſe defects, SEWEL's hiſtory is abundantly ſufficient to enable an impartial and intelligent reader to form a juſt and ſatisfactory idea of this viſionary ſect. VOLTAIRE has alſo entertained the public with *Four Letters*, concerning the *Religion, Manners*, and *Hiſtory* of the *Quakers*, in his *Melanges de Litterature d'Hiſtoire et de Philoſophie*, which are written with his uſual wit and elegance, but are rather adapted to amuſe than inſtruct. The converſation between him and ANDREW PITT, an eminent Quaker in *London*, which is related in theſe *Letters*, may be true in general; but to render the account of it ſtill more pleaſing, the ingenious writer has embelliſhed it with effuſions of wit and fancy, and even added ſome particulars, that are rather drawn from imagination than memory. It is from the books already mentioned, that the French *Diſſertation on the Religion of the Quakers* (which is placed in the third volume of the ſplendid work, entitled, *Ceremonies et Coutumes Religieuſes de tout les Peuples*), is chiefly compiled, though with leſs attention and accuracy than might have been expected.—A Lutheran writer, named FREDERIC ERNEST MEIS, has given an account of the Engliſh Quakers in a German work, entitled, *Entwurff der Kirchen-Ordnung and Gebräuche der Quäcker in Engeland.*

functions [*kk*]; trampled upon the laws and upon the authority of the magiſtrates, under the pretext of being actuated by a divine impulſe; and made uſe of their pretended inſpiration to

☞ [*kk*] A female, contrary to the modeſty of her ſex, came into *Whitehall* Chapel *ſtark naked*, in the midſt of public worſhip, when CROMWELL was there preſent. Another came into the Parliament-houſe with a trenchard in her hand, which ſhe broke in pieces, ſaying, *Thus ſhall he be broke in pieces.* THOMAS ADAMS, having complained to the protector of the impriſonment of ſome of his friends, and not finding redreſs, he took off his cap and tore it in pieces, ſaying, *So ſhall thy government be torn from thee and thy houſe.* Several, pretending an extraordinary meſſage from heaven, went about the ſtreets, denouncing the judgments of God againſt the Protector and his council; and one came to the door of the Parliament-houſe with a drawn ſword, and wounded ſeveral, ſaying, *He was inſpired by the Holy Spirit to kill every man that ſat in that houſe.* The moſt extravagant Quaker that appeared in this time, was JAMES NAYLOR, formerly an officer, a man of parts, and ſo much admired by theſe fanatics, that they blaſphemouſly ſtiled him, *The everlaſting ſon of righteouſneſs; the prince of peace; the only begotten ſon of God; the faireſt among ten thouſand.* See NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*;—*The Life and Trial of* NAYLOR, p. 6, 7, &c. The anonymous author of the *Letter to Dr. Formey*, F. R. S. ſeems to have loſt ſight of the ſtate of Quakeriſm in the time of Fox, when he denies that the charge of turbulence and fanaticiſm can be proved againſt him or his friends, and gives the gentle denomination of *imprudence* to the extravagancies exhibited by the Quakers under CHARLES I., and the Commonwealth. The ſingle ſtory of NAYLOR, who was the convert and pupil of Fox, the letters, full of blaſphemous abſurdity, written to this *Roſe of Sharon*, this *new Jeſus*, by HANNAH STRANGER, RICHARD FAIRMAN, and others, ſhew the horrid vein of fanaticiſm that ran through this viſionary ſect. See theſe Letters in the *Life and Trial of* NAYLOR, who, though cruelly ſcourged, was, however, whipped into his ſenſes, or, at leaſt, brought by his ſufferings into a calmer ſtate of mind. See alſo *Satan Inthroned*, &c. p. 4 and 5. If Quakeriſm be now in *England* on a more *rational* footing, we may congratulate its members upon the happy change, but at the ſame time condole with them on the approaching annihilation of their ſect; for if *reaſon* gets in among them, the *ſpirit* (I mean *their* ſpirit) will ſoon be quenched, and fancy being no more the only criterion of truth, the fundamental principle of their exiſtence will be deſtroyed. In ſuch a cataſtrophe, the abettors of ancient Quakeriſm will find ſome reſource among the Methodiſts.

excite the moſt vehement commotions both in ſtate and church. Hence it is not at all ſurpriſing, that the ſecular arm was at length raiſed againſt theſe pernicious fanatics, and that many of them were ſeverely chaſtiſed for their extravagance and folly [l]. CROMWELL himſelf, who was, generally ſpeaking, an enemy to no ſect, however enthuſiaſtical it might be, entertained uneaſy apprehenſions from the frantic violence of the Quakers, and therefore, in his firſt thoughts, formed a reſolution to ſuppreſs their riſing community. But when he perceived that they treated with contempt both his promiſes and threatenings; and were, in effect, too powerful or too headſtrong to yield to either, he prudently abſtained from the uſe of force, and contented himſelf with employing wiſe meaſures and precautions to prevent their fomenting ſedition among the people, or undermining the foundations of his new ſovereignty [m].

The progreſs of this ſect under Charles II. and James II.

III. In proceſs of time, the fumes of this exceſſive fanaticiſm began to evaporate, and the ardent impetuoſity of the riſing ſect ſeemed gradually to ſubſide; nor did the *divine light*, of which the Quakers boaſt, produce ſuch tumults in church and ſtate, as at the firſt declaration of their celeſtial pretenſions. Under the reign of CHARLES II., both their religious doctrine and diſcipline aſſumed a more regular and permanent form, by the care and induſtry of Fox, aſſiſted, in this very neceſſary undertaking, by Robert BARCLAY, GEORGE KEITH, and SAMUEL FISHER, men of learning and abilities, who became, notwithſtanding, members of this ſtrange community. Fox ſtood in urgent need of ſuch able aſſiſtants; for his groſs ignorance had rendered his religion, hitherto, a confuſed medley of incoherent tenets and viſions. The new triumvirate, therefore, uſed their utmoſt endeavours to digeſt theſe under certain heads, and to reduce them to a ſort of theological ſyſtem [*n*]. But ſuch was the change of times, that the wiſer and more moderate Quakers in *England* ſuffered more vexations, and were involved in greater calamities, than had fallen to the lot of their frantic and turbulent anceſtors. Theſe vexations, indeed, were not ſo much the conſequence of their religious principles, as of their ſingular cuſtoms and manners in civil life. For they would never give to magiſtrates thoſe titles of honour and pre-eminence that are deſigned to mark the reſpect due to their authority; they alſo refuſed obſtinately to take the oath of allegiance to their ſovereign [*o*], and to pay tithes to the clergy; hence they were looked upon as rebellious ſubjects, and, on that account, were frequently puniſhed with great ſeverity [*p*]. Under the reign of JAMES II., and more particularly about the year 1685, they began to ſee more proſperous days, and to enjoy the ſweets of toleration and liberty, which they owed not to the clemency of the government, but to the friendſhip of that monarch for the famous WILLIAM PENN [q], who had been employed by him in matters of the utmoſt moment, and had rendered him ſignal and important ſervices [r]. What JAMES had done, from motives of a perſonal or political nature, in favour of the Quakers, King WILLIAM III. confirmed and continued, from a zeal for maintaining the rights of conſcience, and advancing the cauſe of religious liberty. From theſe motives, he procured a full and ample toleration for diſſenters of almoſt all denominations; and the Quakers, in conſequence of this grant, enjoyed at length, upon a conſtitutional footing, tranquillity and freedom [s].

---

[l] NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. iv. p. 153.—SEWEL's *Hiſtory*, &c. *paſſim*.

[m] CLARENDON tells us, in his *Hiſtory of the Rebellion*, that the Quakers always perſevered in their bitter enmity againſt CROMWELL. See SEWEL's *Hiſtory*, book i. p. 91. 113. 148, 149.

[*n*] For an account of the life and writings of BARCLAY, ſee the *General Dictionary*.—SEWEL, in his *Hiſtory of the Quakers*, gives an ample account of KEITH. There is alſo particular mention made of FISHER, in a German work, intitled, *Unſchuldige Nachricht*, 1750, p. 338.

☞ [*o*] This refuſal to take the oath of allegiance did not proceed from any diſaffection to the government, but from a perſuaſion that all *oaths* were unlawful, and that *ſwearing*, even upon the moſt ſolemn occaſions, was forbidden in the New Teſtament. They alſo ſincerely believed, that they were as much obliged to obedience by an *affirmation*, which they were willing to make, as by an oath.

[*p*] See a circumſtantial account of their ſufferings under CHARLES II., in NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. iv. p. 313. 353. 396. 432. 510. 518. 552. 569.—BURNET's *Hiſtory of his own Times*, vol. i. p. 271.—SEWEL, *loc. cit.* paſſim.

---

[q] See SEWEL's *Hiſtory of the Quakers*.

☞ [r] The indulgence of James II. towards the *Quakers*, and other diſſenters from the eſtabliſhed church, was, at bottom, founded on a zeal for popery, and deſigned to favour the Roman Catholics. More particularly the order he ſent to the Lord Mayor of *London*, the 7th of *November* 1687, to diſpenſe with the Quakers not ſwearing, was evidently deſigned to open a door to the Roman Catholics to bear offices in the ſtate without a legal qualification.—At the ſame time it was probable enough, that a perſonal attachment to the famous WILLIAM PENN may have contributed to render this monarch more indulgent to this ſect than he would otherwiſe have been. The reaſons of this attachment are differently repreſented. Some ſuppoſe it to have been owing to the ſervices of his father in the fleet commanded againſt the Dutch, in the year 1665, by King JAMES, when Duke of *York*. Others attribute this attachment to his perſonal ſervices. From the high degree of favour he enjoyed at court, they conclude that he was a concealed papiſt, and aſſiſted the king in the execution of his deſigns. That the imputation of popery was groundleſs, appears from his correſpondence with Dr. TILLOTSON, which is publiſhed in the *Life of* PENN, that is prefixed to the firſt volume of the works of the latter. It is nevertheleſs certain, that he was very intimate with Father PETERS, the hot-headed Jeſuit, whoſe bigotry formed the king's projects, and whoſe imprudence rendered them abortive. It is alſo certain, that, in the year 1686, he went over to *Holland*, in order to perſuade the prince of *Orange* to come into King JAMES's meaſures.

The propagation of Quakeriſm out of *England*.

IV. Fatigued with the vexations and perſecution which they ſuffered in their native country during the reign of CHARLES II., the *Quakers* looked about for ſome diſtant ſettlements, where they might ſhelter themſelves from the ſtorm; and with this view began to diſſeminate their religious principles in various countries. Attempts of this nature were made in *Germany*, *Pruſſia*, *France*, *Italy*, *Greece*, *Holland*, and *Holſtein*, but with little ſucceſs. The Dutch, however, were, after much importunity, perſuaded to allow a certain number of theſe enthuſiaſts to ſettle in *Holland*, where they ſtill continue to reſide. Multitudes of them alſo went over to *America*, and formed ſettlements there not long after the firſt riſe of their ſect; and it afterwards happened, by a ſingular concourſe of events, that this new world became the chief ſeat of their proſperity and freedom. WILLIAM PENN, ſon of the famous vice-admiral of that name, who embraced *Quakeriſm* in the year 1668, received, in the year 1680, from CHARLES II., and from the Engliſh parliament, the grant of an ample, fertile, but uncultivated province in *America*, as a reward for the eminent ſervices of his father. This illuſtrious Quaker, who was far from being deſtitute of parts, and whoſe activity and penetration were accompanied with an uncommon degree of eloquence [t], carried over with him into his new dominions a conſiderable colony of his *Friends* and Brethren; and he founded in thoſe diſtant regions a republic, whoſe form, laws, and inſtitutions, reſembled no other known ſyſtem of government, whoſe pacific principles and commercial ſpirit have long bleſſed it with tranquillity and opulence, and which ſtill continues in a proſperous and flouriſhing ſtate [*u*]. The *Quakers* predominate in this colony, both by their influence and their numbers; but all thoſe who acknowledge the exiſtence and providence of one Supreme Being, and ſhew their reſpect to that Being, either by external worſhip, or at leaſt by the regularity of their lives and actions, are admitted to the rights and privileges of citizens in this happy republic. The large province that conſtitutes its territory was called *Pennſylvania*, from the name of its proprietor; and its capital city was named *Philadelphia*, from the ſpirit of union and fraternal love that reigned at firſt, and is ſtill ſuppoſed to prevail, more or leſs, among its inhabitants.

---

[s] *Oeuvres de M. de* VOLTAIRE, tom. iv. p. 182.

☞ [t] Biſhop BURNET, who knew PENN perſonally, ſays, that "he was a talking vain man, who had ſuch a high opinion of his own eloquence, that he thought nothing could ſtand before it; and that he had a tedious *luſcious* way, that was not apt to overcome a man's reaſon, though it might tire his patience."

The inteſtine diſputes and conteſts of the Quakers.

V. Even during the life of their founder, the Quakers, notwithſtanding their extraordinary pretenſions to fraternal charity and union, were frequently divided into parties, and involved in conteſts and debates. Theſe debates, indeed, which were carried on in the years 1656, 1661, and 1683, with peculiar warmth, were not occaſioned by any doctrines of a religious nature, but by a diverſity of opinions about matters of diſcipline, about certain cuſtoms and manners, and other affairs of little moment; and they were generally terminated in a ſhort time, and without much difficulty [w]. But, after the death of Fox, which happened in the year 1691, ſome *Friends*, and more eſpecially GEORGE KEITH, who was by far the moſt learned member of the community, excited, by their doctrines and innovations, new diſcords of a much more ſerious and momentous kind than thoſe which had before divided the *Brethren*. This fountain of contention was opened in *Pennſylvania*, where KEITH was charged with erroneous opinions concerning ſeveral points of theology, and more particularly concerning the *Human Nature of* CHRIST, which he ſuppoſed to be two-fold, the one ſpiritual and celeſtial, the other corporeal and terreſtrial [x]. This and other inventions of KEITH would perhaps have paſſed without cenſure, among a people who reduce the whole of religion to fancy and a kind of ſpiritual inſtinct, had not this learned man animadverted, with a certain degree of ſeverity, upon ſome of the fantaſtic notions of the American Brethren, and oppoſed, in a more particular manner, their method of converting the whole hiſtory of CHRIST's life and ſufferings into a mere allegory, or ſymbolical repreſentation of the duties of Chriſtianity. The European *Quakers* dare not ſo far preſume upon the indulgence of the civil and eccleſiaſtical powers, as to deny openly the *reality* of the hiſtory of the life, mediation, and ſufferings of CHRIST; but in *America*, where they have nothing to fear, they are ſaid to expreſs themſelves without ambiguity, on this ſubject, and to maintain publicly, that CHRIST never exiſted, but in the hearts of the *faithful*. This point was debated between KEITH and his adverſaries, in ſeveral general aſſemblies of the ſect held in *England*, and was at length brought before the parliament. The conteſt was terminated in the year 1695, by the excommunication of KEITH and his adherents, which ſo exaſperated this famous *Quaker* [y], that he returned, ſome years after this, into the boſom of the Engliſh church, and died in its communion [z]. His friends and followers continued, for a long time, to hold their aſſemblies and exerciſe their religion in a ſtate of ſeparation from the reſt of the ſect; but now, if we may believe public fame, they are reconciled with their Brethren [a].

[*u*] The laws and charters of the colony of *Pennſylvania* may be ſeen in RAPIN's Hiſtory, PENN's Works, and in other collections of public records; they are alſo inſerted in the *Bibliotheque Britannique*, tom. xv. p. 310. tom. xvi. p. 127.—PENN acquired a great reputation, both by his writings and the active figure he made in life. See the accounts given of him by SEWEL and BURNET.

---

[w] See SEWEL's *Hiſtory of the Quakers*.

☞ [x] *Ceremonies et Coutumes de tous les Peuples du monde*, tom. iv. p. 141.—CROESII *Hiſtoria Quakeriana*, lib. iii. p. 446.

☞ [y] Biſhop BURNET, who was certainly better acquainted with the hiſtory of KEITH (with whom he had been educated) than Dr. MOSHEIM, attributes his return to the church of *England* to a much worthier motive than irritation and reſentment. He tells us that KEITH, after that the American Quakers had appeared to him as little better than Deiſts, oppoſed them ſo warmly, that they ſent him back to *England*. Here he opened a new meeting, and by a printed ſummons called together the whole party to convince them of theſe errors. "He continued theſe meetings, *ſays the biſhop*, being "ſtill, in outward appearance, a Quaker, for ſome years; till, "having prevailed as far as he ſaw any appearance of ſucceſs, "he laid aſide their exterior, and was reconciled to the "church." See BURNET's *Hiſtory of his own Times*, vol. ii. p. 249.

[z] See BURNET, ibid.—SEWEL's account of the troubles occaſioned by KEITH, in his *Hiſtory of the Quakers*. But SEWEL was either unacquainted with the true nature and ſtate of this controverſy, which, as he was an illiterate man, may well have been the caſe, or he has given deſignedly a falſe and ambiguous repreſentation of the matter. See the life of CUSTER, in the *Europa Erudita* of RAHTLEFUS *, where this controverſy is placed in its true light. KUSTER was a man of probity, who lived at that time in *America*, and was an eye-witneſs of theſe diviſions.

[a] See ROGER's *Chriſtian Quaker*, publiſhed in 4to at *London*, in the year 1699;—as alſo, *The Quakers a Divided People*, publiſhed in 1708.—*Unſchuldig. Nachright*. 1744. p. 496.

* This work is written in German.

The religion of the Quakers conſidered in a general point of view.

VI. The religion of the ſect, called *Quakers*, has an air of novelty that ſtrikes at firſt ſight; but, when viewed cloſely, it will appear to be nothing more than a certain modification of that famous *myſtic theology*, which aroſe ſo early as the ſecond century, was foſtered and embelliſhed by the luxuriant fancy of ORIGEN, and paſſing through various hands, aſſumed different aſpects until it was adopted by the *Quakers*, who ſet off the motely form with new additions of their own invention. Fox, indeed, is not chargeable with theſe inventions; his ignorant and inelegant ſimplicity places him beyond the reach of ſuſpicion in this matter; but it is, at the ſame time, undoubtedly certain, that all his doctrine concerning the *internal word*, and the divine light within, its operations and effects, was either borrowed from the writings of the Myſtics, which were, at that time, in the hands of many, or at leaſt picked up from the converſation and expreſſions of ſome perſons of the Myſtic order. The tenets, however, which this blunt and illiterate man expreſſed in a rude, confuſed, and ambiguous manner, were dreſſed up and preſented under a different form by the maſterly hands of BARCLAY, KEITH, FISHER, and PENN, who digeſted them with ſuch ſagacity and art, that they aſſumed the aſpect of a regular ſyſtem. The *Quakers* may therefore be deemed with reaſon the principal branch of the *Myſtics*, as they not only embraced the precepts of their *hidden wiſdom*, but even ſaw its whole tendency, and adopted, without heſitation, all its conſequences [b].

VII. The

---

[b] Moſt people are of opinion, that we are to learn the true doctrine and ſentiments of the Quakers from the *Catechiſm* of ROBERT BARCLAY, and more eſpecially from his *Apology for the true Chriſtian Divinity*, &c. which was publiſhed at *London* in 4to, in the year 1676, and was tranſlated into ſeveral foreign

The principal tenet of the Quakers.

VII. The fundamental doctrine of *Quakeriſm*, from whence all their other tenets are derived, is

---

reign languages. Nor do I deny, that the members of this ſect are very deſirous that we ſhould judge of their religious ſentiments by the doctrine that is exhibited in theſe books. But if thoſe who are diſpoſed to judge by this rule go ſo far as to maintain, that theſe books contain all the religious tenets that have formerly been advanced, or are at preſent adopted by the people called *Quakers*, they may be refuted, without difficulty, from a great variety of books and records, of unqueſtionable authenticity. It is neceſſary to enter into the true ſpirit of BARCLAY's writings. This ingenious man appeared as a *Patron* and *Defender* of Quakeriſm, and not as a profeſſed teacher or expoſitor of its various doctrines; and he interpreted and modified the opinions of this ſect after the manner of a champion or advocate, who undertakes the defence of an odious cauſe. How then does he go to work? In the firſt place, he obſerves an entire ſilence in relation to thoſe fundamental principles of Chriſtianity, concerning which it is of great conſequence to know the real opinions of the Quakers; and thus he exhibits a ſyſtem of theology that is evidently lame and imperfect. For it is the peculiar buſineſs of a prudent apologiſt to paſs over in ſilence points that are ſcarcely ſuſceptible of a plauſible defence, and to enlarge upon thoſe only which the powers of genius and eloquence may be able to embelliſh and exhibit in an advantageous point of view. It is obſervable, in the ſecond place, that BARCLAY touches in a ſlight, ſuperficial, and haſty manner, ſome tenets, which, when amply explained, had expoſed the Quakers to ſevere cenſures; and in this he diſcovers plainly the weakneſs of his cauſe. Laſtly, to omit many other obſervations that might be made here, this writer employs the greateſt dexterity and art in ſoftening and modifying thoſe invidious doctrines which he cannot conceal, and dare not diſavow; for which purpoſe he carefully avoids all thoſe phraſes and terms that are made uſe of by the *Quakers*, and are peculiar to their ſect, and expreſſes their tenets in ordinary language, in terms of a vague and indefinite nature, and in a ſtile that caſts a ſort of maſk over their natural aſpect. At this rate the moſt enormous errors may be held with impunity; for there is no doctrine, however abſurd, to which a plauſible air may not be given by following the inſidious method of BARCLAY; and it is well known, that even the doctrine of SPINOSA was, with a like artifice, dreſſed out and diſguiſed by ſome of his diſciples. The other writers of this ſect have declared their ſentiments with more freedom, perſpicuity, and candour, particularly the famous WILLIAM PENN and GEORGE WHITEHEAD, whoſe

writings

is that famous and ancient opinion of the Myſtic ſchool, "*That there lies concealed in the minds of* "*all men a certain portion of divine reaſon, a ſpark* "*of the ſame wiſdom that exiſts in the Supreme* "*Being.* Therefore, thoſe who are deſirous of arriving at true felicity and eternal ſalvation, "muſt, according to their ſyſtem, by ſelf-converſe, contemplation, and perpetual efforts to "ſubdue their ſenſual affections, endeavour to "draw forth, kindle, and inflame that *divine,* "*hidden ſpark,* which is overpowered by the "*darkneſs of the fleſh,* and ſuffocated, as it were, "by that maſs of matter with which it is ſurrounded. They who obſerve this rule, will "feel, ſay the Quakers, a divine glow of warmth "and light, and hear a celeſtial and divine voice "proceeding from the inward receſſes of their "ſouls; and by this light and this voice they "will be led to all truth, and be perfectly aſſured "of their union with the Supreme Being." This hidden treaſure, which is poſſeſſed, though not improved, by all the human race, bears different denominations in the language of this fanatical ſect. They frequently call it *divine light,* ſometimes a *ray of the eternal wiſdom,* at others, the *heavenly Sophia,* whom they ſuppoſe married to a mortal, and whoſe wedding garments ſome of their writers deſcribe with the moſt gaudy and pompous

---

writings deſerve an attentive peruſal preferably to all the other productions of that community. There is, among other writings of theſe eminent Quakers, one in whoſe compoſition they were both concerned, and which was publiſhed at *London,* in the year 1674, under the following title: *The Chriſtian Quaker and his Divine Teſtimony vindicated by Scripture, Reaſon, and Authorities, againſt the injurious Attempts that have been lately made by ſeveral Adverſaries.* The *firſt Part* of this book was written by PENN; and the *ſecond* by WHITEHEAD. There is alſo in SEWEL's Hiſtory, a *Confeſſion of Faith,* that was publiſhed by the Quakers in the year 1693, during their controverſy with KEITH; but this confeſſion is compoſed with great prudence, and is full of ambiguity.

pompous eloquence. But the moſt uſual epithets given to this ſpiritual treaſure are thoſe of the *internal word*, and of CHRIST *within*; for as, on the one hand, they adopt that doctrine of ORIGEN, and the ancient Myſtics, which repreſents CHRIST as the eternal reaſon, or wiſdom of God; and, on the other, maintain, that all men are endowed naturally with a certain portion of the divine wiſdom; they are thus directly led to affirm, that CHRIST, or the *word* of God, dwells and ſpeaks in the hearts of all men [c].

The tenets that flow from this fundamental doctrine.

VIII. All the ſingularities and wonderful fancies, that are to be found in the religious ſyſtem of the Quakers, are the immediate conſequences of the fundamental principle now mentioned. For ſince CHRIST reſides in the inward frame of every mortal; it follows, "*Firſt*, That the whole "of religion conſiſts in calling off the mind from "external objects, in weakening the influence "and aſcendant of the outward ſenſes, and in "every one's entering deeply into the inmoſt "receſſes of his heart, and liſtening attentively "to the divine inſtructions and commands that "the *internal word* or CHRIST *within* delivers "there; *ſecondly*, That the *external word*, *i. e.* the "holy Scripture, neither points out the way of "ſalvation, nor leads men to it; ſince it only "conſiſts of *letters* and *words*, which, being *void* "*of life*, have not a degree of efficacy and power "ſufficient to *illuminate* the human mind, and to "unite it to God. The only advantage that, in "their opinion, reſults from a peruſal of the "holy Scriptures, is, that they excite the mind

---

[c] It is nevertheleſs to be obſerved, that the modern Quakers, as appears from the writings of MARTYN and others, are, generally ſpeaking, ignorant of the ſyſtem of their anceſtors, and perpetually confound the innate divine light abovementioned, with the operations of the Holy Ghoſt in the minds of the faithful.

" to liſten to the dictates of the *internal word*,
" and to go to the ſchool of CHRIST, who teaches
" *within them*; or, to expreſs the ſame thing in
" other words, they look upon the bible as a
" mute maſter, who, by ſigns and figures, points
" out and diſcovers that *living maſter* and effectual
" guide who dwells in the mind. *Thirdly*,
" That they who are without this written word,
" ſuch as the Jews, Mahometans, and ſavage nations,
" are not, on that account, either removed
" from the path, or deſtitute of the doctrine of
" ſalvation, though they indeed want this inferior
" and ſubordinate help to its attainment.
" For if they only attend to this *inward teacher*,
" who always *ſpeaketh* when the *man* is *ſilent*, they
" will learn abundantly, from him, all that is
" neceſſary to be known and practiſed in order
" to their final happineſs; that of conſequence,
" *fourthly*, The kingdom of CHRIST is of a vaſt
" extent, and comprehends the whole race of
" mankind. For all have CHRIST within them,
" and therefore, even thoſe who are deprived
" of the means of knowledge, and live in the
" groſſeſt ignorance of the Chriſtian religion, are
" capable of obtaining, through him, wiſdom
" here, and happineſs hereafter. Hence alſo
" they conclude, that thoſe who lead virtuous
" lives, and reſiſt the impulſe of their luſts and
" paſſions, whether they be Jews, Mahometans,
" or Polytheiſts, ſhall be united to God in this
" life, by means of the CHRIST that lies hidden
" within them, and ſhall enjoy the fruits of this
" union in the life to come. To theſe tenets
" they add, in the *fifth* place, That a heavy, dark
" body, compoſed of corrupt matter, hinders
" men from diſcerning, with eaſe, this *hidden*
" CHRIST, and from hearing his divine and internal
" voice. Therefore they look upon it as
" a matter of the higheſt importance, to watch

" againſt the pernicious conſequences of this " union between the ſoul and body, that the latter may not blunt the powers of the former, " diſturb its tranquillity, or, by the miniſtry of " the outward ſenſes, fill it with the images of " vain, ſenſible, and external objects." The conſideration now mentioned engages them, *laſtly*, " To look upon it as utterly incredible, " that God ſhould ever again ſhut up, in the " ſame material habitation, the ſouls that are ſet " free by death from their bodily priſon; and " therefore they affirm, that the Goſpel-account " of the reſurrection of the body muſt either be " interpreted in a figurative ſenſe, or be under-" ſtood as pointing out the creation of a new " and celeſtial body [d]."

Their doctrine concerning Chriſt.

IX. It appears evidently from all this, that the exiſtence of the man CHRIST JESUS, together with the circumſtantial accounts we have in Scripture of his divine origin, his life, and actions, his ſatisfaction, merits, and ſufferings, make no eſſential part of the theological ſyſtem of the Quakers, which is built upon a different foundation, and derives the whole plan and method of ſalvation from the CHRIST *within*. Hence ſeveral members of that ſect, as we learn from writers of unqueſtionable authority, went ſuch an extravagant length as to maintain, that the accounts we have of JESUS CHRIST, in the Goſpel-hiſtory, do not relate to the ſon of God, who took upon him the nature of man, but to that CHRIST *within*, whoſe operations are recorded by the ſacred hiſtorians in a figurative and allegorical language. This opinion, if we may confide in the teſtimonies of unexceptionable witneſſes, is ſo far from having loſt its credit among them, that it is ſtill openly profeſſed by the American Quakers. Thoſe of *Europe*, whether from the force of conviction or the ſuggeſtions of prudence, differ entirely from their brethren in this reſpect; they hold, "That the divine *wiſdom* or *reaſon* "reſided in the *Son* of the Virgin Mary, and "conveyed its inſtructions to mankind by his "miniſtry;" and they profeſs to believe, "that "this divine man *really* did and ſuffered what is "recorded concerning him by the ſacred writers." It is nevertheleſs certain, that they expreſs themſelves in a very ambiguous manner on many points that relate to the hiſtory of the divine Saviour; and, in a more particular manner, their notions concerning the fruits of his ſufferings, and the efficacy of his death, are ſo vague and obſcure, that it is very difficult to know what is their real opinion about the degree of this efficacy, and the nature of theſe fruits. It is ſtill further worthy of obſervation, that the European Quakers, though they acknowledge the *reality* of the life, actions, and ſufferings of CHRIST, yet do not entirely reject the allegorical interpretation of our Saviour's Hiſtory mentioned above; for they conſider the events that happened to CHRIST, in the courſe of his miniſtry here upon earth, as the ſigns and emblems of thoſe ſcenes through which the *mental* CHRIST muſt paſs, in order to render us partakers of eternal ſalvation. Hence they talk in high-ſwoln and pompous ſtrains (like their models the Myſtics) of the birth, life, ſufferings, death, and reſurrection of CHRIST *in the hearts of the faithful.*

---

[d] The Quakers adopt all theſe tenets; they are at leaſt obliged to adopt them, unleſs they renounce the fundamental principles of their ſyſtem. We have omitted the mention of thoſe points about which they diſpute among themſelves, that we may not appear to take pleaſure in repreſenting them under odious colours.

Their religious diſcipline and worſhip.

X. The religious diſcipline, worſhip, and practice of the Quakers, flow from the ſame original ſource from which, as we have already obſerved,

ſerved, their doctrine and tenets were immediately derived. They meet for the purpoſes of religion on the ſame days which are ſet apart for the celebration of public worſhip in all other Chriſtian churches; but they neither obſerve feſtivals, nor uſe external rites and ceremonies, nor ſuffer religion, which they place entirely in the mental worſhip of the *Hidden* CHRIST, to be ſhackled and cramped by poſitive inſtitutions. All the members of their community, whether male or female, have an equal right to teach and exhort in their public meetings; for who, ſay they, will preſume to exclude from the liberty of ſpeaking to the *Brethren*, thoſe perſons in whom CHRIST dwells, and by whom he ſpeaks? They reject the uſe of prayers, hymns, and the various outward forms of devotion, by which the public worſhip of other Chriſtian churches is diſtinguiſhed; and this, indeed, is an inſtance of their conſiſtency with themſelves, as it is the immediate conſequence of their religious ſyſtem; for, in their judgment, it is not the perſon who expreſſes his deſires in a ſet form of words, that can be ſaid to pray truly, but he, on the contrary, who, by a deep recollection, withdraws his mind from every outward object, reduces it to a ſtate of abſolute tranquillity, ſilences every inward motion and affection, and plunges it, as it were, into the abyſs of Deity. They neither obſerve the inſtitution of *Baptiſm*, nor do they renew the remembrance of CHRIST's death, and of the benefits that reſult from it, by the celebration of the *Euchariſt*. They look upon theſe two inſtitutions as merely Judaical, and allege, that our Saviour obſerved them for no other end than to ſhew for once, in a viſible manner, the myſtical purification of the ſoul, under the figure of baptiſm, and the ſpiritual nouriſhment of the inward man, under that of the Euchariſt.

XI. The

Their moral precepts.

XI. The moral doctrine of the Quakers, which is remarkable for its exceſſive auſterity, is chiefly comprehended in the two following precepts: *Firſt*, "That the faithful are either to avoid entirely every thing that tends to gratify the external ſenſes and paſſions, every thing that can "be ranked under the denomination of ſenſual "or bodily pleaſure; or, if ſuch rigorous abſtinence be impoſſible in this preſent ſtate, and "contrary to the evident laws of nature, ſuch "pleaſure is to be ſo modified and reſtrained by "reaſon and meditation, as to prevent its debaſing and corrupting the mind. For as the "whole attention of the mind muſt be given to "the voice and orders of the *internal guide*, ſo, "for this purpoſe, all poſſible care muſt be "taken to remove it from the contagion of the "body, and from all intimate and habitual commerce with corporeal objects." By the *ſecond* leading precept of morality among the Quakers, all imitation of thoſe external manners, that go by the name of civility and politeneſs, as alſo ſeveral matters of form, uſual in the conduct of life and in the connexions of human ſociety, are ſtrictly prohibited as unlawful. Hence they are eaſily diſtinguiſhed from all other Chriſtian ſects, by their outward deportment and their manner of life. They never ſalute any perſon they meet in their way, nor employ in their converſation the uſual manner of addreſs, and the appellations that civility and cuſtom have rendered a matter of decency, at leaſt, if not of duty; they never expreſs their reſpect for magiſtrates or perſons in authority, either by bodily geſtures, titles of honour, or in general by any of the marks of homage that are paid them by perſons of all other denominations. They carry their pacific ſentiments to ſuch an extravagant length, as to renounce the right of ſelf-defence, and let paſs with impunity, and even without reſiſtance, the attacks that are made on their poſſeſſions, their reputation, nay, on their lives. They refuſe to confirm their teſtimonies by an oath, to appear in behalf of their property before a civil tribunal, or to accuſe thoſe who have injured them. To theſe negative parts of their external conduct, they add peculiar circumſtances of a poſitive kind, that diſcover the ſame auſtere, ſtiff, proud, and formal ſpirit; for they diſtinguiſh themſelves, in a ſtriking manner, from the reſt of their fellow-citizens, by the gravity of their aſpect, the ruſtic ſimplicity of their apparel, the affected tone of their voice, the ſtiffneſs of their converſation, and the frugality of their tables. It is, however, affirmed by perſons of credit, who are eye-witneſſes of what paſſes among the members of this ſect, that the modern, and more eſpecially the Engliſh Quakers, whom trade has furniſhed with the means of luxury, have departed from this rigid and auſtere manner of life, and daily grow more reconciled to the outward pleaſures and enjoyments of the world. Theſe more ſociable Quakers are alſo ſaid to modify and explain the theology of their anceſtors, in ſuch a manner as to render it more rational than it was in its primitive ſtate. At the ſame time it is certain, that many of the members of this ſect have either a falſe notion, or no notion at all, of that ancient theology.

Their form of eccleſiaſtical government.

XII. The principles of this community ſeem to exclude the very idea of order, diſcipline, and eccleſiaſtical government. Its leading members, however, began to perceive, in proceſs of time, that without laws and rulers it could not ſubſiſt, but muſt inevitably fall into confuſion and ruin. They accordingly erected a council of *Elders*, who diſcuſs and determine matters of a doubtful or difficult nature, and uſe all poſſible care and diligence

ligence in inſpecting the conduct of the Brethren, and in preventing whatever they look upon as prejudicial to the intereſts of the community. The names of thoſe that enter into the ſtate of wedlock are given in to thoſe leading members, who alſo keep an exact regiſter of the births and deaths that happen in their ſociety. They exerciſe, moreover, a certain degree of authority over thoſe who ſpeak in their meetings; ſince it is well known, that in ſome places theſe ſpeakers ſhew their diſcourſes to the ruling Elders before they deliver them, in order that they may judge whether or no they are fit to be repeated in public. For ſince the abuſe that was made of the unbounded liberty that every individual had to inſtruct and exhort the congregation, and to ſpeak and harangue when the pretended *ſpirit moved them*, new regulations have been obſerved: and this liberty has been conſiderably modified, in ſeveral places, to avoid the mockery, contempt, and cenſure, to which the community was conſtantly expoſed, by the abſurd, incoherent, and inſipid diſcourſes of many of its members. There are alſo in ſome of the more conſiderable congregations, and more eſpecially in thoſe that are erected at *London*, certain perſons, whoſe vocation it is to be always prepared to ſpeak to the people, in caſe none of the congregation find themſelves *inwardly moved*, or diſpoſed to perform that office. The appointment of theſe profeſſed ſpeakers was deſigned to remedy an inconveniency that frequently happened in the Quaker-meetings, even that the whole aſſembly was diſmiſſed without either inſtruction or exhortation, becauſe none found themſelves *moved* to ſpeak. It is indeed to be obſerved, that this public diſcourſe is not looked upon by the Quakers as an eſſential part of their religion and worſhip; for the *Brethren* and *Siſters* do not meet that they may hear the words of an external teacher, but that they may liſten with recollection to the voice of the *divine inſtructor*, which every one carries with him in his own breaſt, or, to uſe their own phraſe, that they may *commune with themſelves*. Neverthelefs, as theſe mute aſſemblies excite the laughter of their adverſaries, and expoſe them to the reproach of enthuſiaſm and frenzy, they have, on that account, appointed fixed ſpeakers, to whom they give a ſmall ſalary, that the whole time of their meeting may not be paſſed in ſilence [*d*].

The Quakers have, annually, a general aſſembly of the whole ſect, which meets at *London* the week before Whitſunday, and is compoſed of deputies from all their particular congregations. They ſtill complain, notwithſtanding the toleration they enjoy, of certain ſeverities and hardſhips; but theſe are entirely owing to their obſtinate refuſal to pay thoſe tithes, which, by the laws of the land, are deſigned for the ſupport of the eſtabliſhed church.

☞ [*d*] The truth of this account of *fixed Speakers* appointed to diſcourſe and exhort, when the ſpirit does not move any of the other brethren, and *rewarded* for their pains, is denied by the writer of the *Letter to Dr.* FORMEY; we leave the deciſion of the matter to thoſe who have an opportunity of examining the fact.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the MENNONITES, *or* ANABAPTISTS.

The various fortunes of the Mennonites.

I. AFTER various ſcenes of trial and perplexity, the Mennonites at length found, during this century, the tranquillity they had long ſought after in vain. They arrived, indeed, at this ſtate of repoſe by very ſlow ſteps; for though, in the preceding age, they were admitted to the rights and privileges of citizens in the *United Provinces*, yet it was a long time before their ſolicitations and pleas of innocence could engage the *Engliſh*, the *Swiſs*, and *Germans*, to receive them in their boſom, and to abrogate the laws that had been enacted againſt them. The civil magiſtrates, in theſe countries, had ſtill before their eyes the enormities committed by the ancient Anabaptiſts; and beſides, they could not perſuade themſelves, that a ſet of men, who looked upon all oaths as *ſinful*, and declared that magiſtracy and penal laws have no place in the kingdom of CHRIST, had the qualities and ſentiments that are neceſſary to conſtitute a good citizen. Hence we find, even in this century, ſeveral examples of great ſeverities employed againſt the Anabaptiſts, and ſome inſtances of even capital puniſhments being inflicted on them [*e*]. But now, that the demonſtrations of their innocence and probity are clear and unqueſtionable,

---

[*e*] The ſeverities exerciſed in *Switzerland* againſt the *Mennonites* are recorded by OTTIUS, in his *Annal. Anabapt.* p. 337. and more particularly thoſe that they ſuffered in the year 1693, by HOTTINGER, in his German work, intitled, *Schweizeriſche Kirchen-Hiſtorie*, vol. i. p. 1101. nor, even in this preſent century, have they been treated more mildly in the Canton of *Bern*, as appears from SCHYN's *Hiſtoria Mennonitar.* cap. x. p. 289. in which we find the letters of the States-General of the *United Provinces* interceding with that Canton in their

ſtionable, they enjoy the ſweets of ſecurity and repoſe, not only in the *United Provinces*, but alſo in *England*, *Germany*, and *Pruſſia*, where they procure, by their honeſt induſtry, and particularly by their application to trade and commerce, an ample ſubſiſtence for themſelves and their families.

Union and concord reſtored among them.

II. The wiſer members of this community eaſily perceived, that their external tranquillity would neither be ſtable nor permanent, unleſs their inteſtine diſcords were removed, and their ancient diſputes, about trifling and unimportant matters, charitably terminated. They accordingly uſed their moſt zealous endeavours to diffuſe the ſweets of charity and concord throughout their ſect; nor were their labours altogether unſucceſsful. In the year 1630, a conſiderable part of the Anabaptiſts of *Flanders*, *Germany*, and *Frieſland*, concluded their debates in a conference held at *Amſterdam*, and entered into the bonds of fraternal communion, each, notwithſtanding, reſerving to themſelves a liberty of retaining certain opinions. This aſſociation was renewed, and confirmed by new reſolutions, in the year 1649, by the Anabaptiſts of *Flanders* and *Germany*, between whom great diviſions had reigned [*f*]. All theſe formed a bond of union with thoſe branches of the ſect that were moſt diſtinguiſhed by their moderation; and they mitigated and corrected, in various reſpects, the rigorous laws of MENNO and his ſucceſſors.

---

their behalf. A ſevere perſecution was ſet on foot againſt them in the *Palatinate* in the year 1694, which was ſuſpended by the interceſſion of WILLIAM III., king of *Great Britain*. See SCHYN, *ibid.* p. 265. Biſhop BURNET mentions ſome inſtances of Anabaptiſts ſuffering death in *England* during the ſeventeenth century, in the firſt volume of his *Hiſtory of his own Times*.

[*f*] HERM. SCHYN, *Plenior Deductio Hiſtoriæ Mennonit.* p. 41, 42.

III. Therefore,

Different ſects of Anabaptiſts.

III. Therefore, at this day, the whole community may be divided into two large ſects, the one comprehending the more *Refined* Anabaptiſts, remarkable for their auſterity, who are alſo called *Flemings* or *Flandrians*; and the others called (in the Dutch language) the *Groſſer* Anabaptiſts, who are of a milder complexion, and an eaſier and more moderate character, and go commonly under the denomination of *Waterlandians*. We have given already a particular account of the origin and etymology of theſe denominations. Each of theſe ſects is ſubdivided into a variety of branches, more eſpecially the *refined* and auſtere Anabaptiſts, who have not only produced two ſeparate ſocieties, diſtinguiſhed by the names of *Groningeniſts* [g], and *Dantzigers* or *Pruſſians* [h], but alſo a conſiderable number of more obſcure and inconſiderable factions, which differ in doctrine, diſcipline, and manners; and agree in nothing but the name of Anabaptiſts, and in ſome ancient opinions that have been unanimouſly embraced by all the members of that ſect. All the refined *Anabaptiſts* are the rigid followers of SIMON-MENNO, and ſtedfaſtly maintain, though not all with the ſame degree of ſeverity and rigour, the ſentiments of their chief on the following points—the human nature of CHRIST—the obligation that binds us to waſh the feet of ſtrangers in conſequence of our Saviour's command—the neceſſity of excommunicating and of avoiding, as one would do the plague, not only avowed ſinners, but alſo thoſe who depart, even in ſome light inſtances, from the ſimplicity of their anceſtors, and are tainted with any appearance of evil—the contempt that is due to human learning, and other matters of leſs moment [*i*]. It is however to be obſerved, that in our times, ſome of the congregations of this *refined* ſect have been gradually departing from this auſtere ſyſtem, and are proceeding, though with a ſlow pace, towards the opinions and diſcipline of the more moderate Anabaptiſts.

---

[g] So called, becauſe they met at certain ſtated times in the city of *Groningen*.

[h] They derive this denomination from their adopting the manners and diſcipline of the Pruſſians.

The external form of the Mennonite church.

IV. All theſe Anabaptiſts adopt a form of eccleſiaſtical government and diſcipline, that is adminiſtered by three diſtinct orders of perſons. The firſt order is that of the *Biſhops* or *Preſbyters*, who always preſide in the conſiſtory, and are alone inveſted with the power of adminiſtering the ſacraments of Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper. The ſecond is that of the *Teachers*, who are ſet apart for the purpoſes of public inſtruction, and the celebration of divine worſhip. The third comprehends the *Deacons*, who are choſen out of both ſexes. Theſe three orders compoſe the conſiſtory or council by which the church is governed. All matters of importance are propoſed, examined, and decided, in the meetings of the Brethren. The miniſters are elected to their holy office by *their* ſuffrages, and are all, the *Deacons* excepted, inſtalled by public prayers, attended with impoſition of hands.

The Uckewalliſts.

V. Among the inferior ſects of the rigid Anabaptiſts, the moſt conſiderable is that which paſſes under the denomination of *Uckewalliſts*, and is ſo called after its founder UKE WALLES, a native of *Frieſland*. This ruſtic, rigid, and ignorant ſectary, not only exhorted his followers to maintain the primitive and auſtere doctrine of MENNO, without ſuffering it to be ſoftened or altered in the ſmalleſt degree, but alſo took it into his head to propagate, jointly with another innovator, named JOHN LEUS, in the year 1637, a ſingular opinion concerning the ſalvation of JUDAS, and the reſt of CHRIST's murderers. To give an air of plauſibility to the favourable opinion he entertained concerning the eternal ſtate of this arch-apoſtate, he invented the following odd hypotheſis, "That the period of time that ex-"tended from the birth of CHRIST to the de-"ſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, and was, as it were, "the diſtinctive term that ſeparated the Jewiſh "from the Chriſtian diſpenſation, was a time of "deep ignorance and darkneſs, during which "the Jews were void of light, and entirely de-"ſtitute of divine ſuccour; and that, of conſe-"quence, the ſins and enormities that were com-"mitted during this interval were in a great "meaſure excuſable, and could not merit the "ſevereſt diſplays of the divine juſtice." This idle fiction met with no indulgence, either from the Mennonites on the one hand, or from the magiſtrates of *Groningen* on the other; for the former excluded its inventor from their communion, and the latter baniſhed him from their city. He fixed his reſidence in the adjacent province of *Eaſt-Frieſland*, and there drew after him a conſiderable number of diſciples, whoſe deſcendants ſtill ſubſiſt in the neighbourhood of *Groningen*, *Frieſland*, and alſo in *Lithuania* and *Pruſſia*, and have their own religious aſſemblies, ſeparate from thoſe of the other Mennonites. As they have little intercourſe with any but thoſe of their own communion, it is not an eaſy matter to know, with certainty, whether they perſevere in the ſingular opinion that proved ſo detrimental to the intereſt of their leader. It is at leaſt certain, that they follow ſcrupulouſly the ſteps of their original founder MENNO, and exhibit a lively image of the primitive manners and conſtitution of the Mennonites. They re-baptize all thoſe who leave other Chriſtian churches to embrace their communion. Their apparel is mean beyond expreſſion, and they avoid every thing that has the moſt diſtant appearance of elegance or ornament. They let their beards grow to an enormous length; their hair, uncombed, lies in a diſorderly manner on their ſhoulders; their countenances are marked with the ſtrongeſt lines of dejection and melancholy; and their habitations and houſehold furniture are ſuch as are only fitted to anſwer the demands of mere neceſſity. Such, moreover, is the ſeverity of their diſcipline, that any member of their community, who departs in the ſmalleſt inſtance from this auſtere rule, is immediately excluded from the ſociety, and avoided by all the Brethren as a public peſt. Their inſpectors or biſhops, whom they diſtinguiſh from the miniſters, whoſe office is to preach and inſtruct, are choſen by an aſſembly compoſed of all the congregations of the ſect. The ceremony of waſhing the feet of ſtrangers, who come within the reach of their hoſpitality, is looked upon by them as a rite of divine inſtitution. We ſhall not enlarge upon the other circumſtances of their ritual, but only obſerve, that they prevent all attempts to alter or modify their religious diſcipline, by preſerving their people from every thing that bears the remoteſt aſpect of learning and ſcience; from whatever, in a word, might have a tendency to enlighten their devout ignorance.

[*i*] See a German work entitled, *Nachrichten von dem gegenwärdigen Zuſtande der Menoniten*, by RUES, 1743.

The Waterlandians.

VI. The more moderate, who are called the *Groſſer*, or leſs ſcrupulous Anabaptiſts, are compoſed of certain inhabitants of *Waterland*, *Flanders*, *Frieſland*, and *Germany*, who entered into an aſſociation, as has been already obſerved, and commonly paſs under the denomination of *Waterlandians*. This community has abandoned the ſevere diſcipline and ſingular opinions of MENNO, whom, nevertheleſs, they generally reſpected as their primitive parent and founder, and have advanced a ſtep nearer than the other Anabaptiſts to the religious doctrines and cuſtoms of other Chriſtian churches. They are, however, divided into two diſtinct ſects, which bear the reſpective denominations of *Frieſlanders* and *Waterlandians*, and are both without biſhops, employing no other eccleſiaſtical miniſters than *Preſbyters* and *Deacons*. Each congregation of this ſect is independent on all foreign juriſdiction, having its own eccleſiaſtical council or conſiſtory, which is compoſed of *Preſbyters* and *Deacons*. The ſupreme ſpiritual power is, nevertheleſs, in the hands of the people, without whoſe conſent nothing of importance can be carried into execution. Their Preſbyters are, generally ſpeaking, men of learning, and apply themſelves with ſucceſs to the ſtudy of phyſic and philoſophy. And there is a public profeſſor ſupported, at preſent, by the ſect at *Amſterdam*, for the inſtruction of their youth in the various branches of philoſophy and ſacred erudition.

The Galeniſts and Apoſtoolians.

VII. One of theſe Waterlandian ſects was divided, in the year 1664, into two factions, of which the one were called *Galeniſts*, and the other *Apoſtoolians*, from their reſpective leaders. The founder of the former was GALEN ABRAHAM HAAN, a doctor of phyſic, and paſtor of a Mennonite congregation at *Amſterdam*, who has received the applauſe even of his enemies, on account of his uncommon penetration and eloquence. This eminent Anabaptiſt, in imitation of the Arminians, conſidered the Chriſtian religion as a ſyſtem that laid much leſs ſtreſs upon faith than upon practice; and he was for receiving into the communion of the Mennonites all thoſe who acknowledged the divine origin of the books of the Old and New Teſtament, and led holy and virtuous lives. Such, in his judgment, were true Chriſtians, and had an undoubted right to all the rights and privileges that belong to that character. Theſe comprehenſive terms of communion were peculiary favourable to his own theological ſentiments, ſince his notions concerning CHRIST's divinity, and the ſalvation of mankind by his death and merits, were very different from thoſe of the Mennonites, and coincided a good deal with the Socinian ſyſtem.

Several perſons oppoſed the ſentiments of this Latitudinarian, and more eſpecially SAMUEL APOSTOOL, an eminent paſtor among the Mennonites at *Amſterdam*, who not only defended, with the utmoſt zeal, the doctrine generally received among the Mennonites, in relation to the divinity of CHRIST and the fruits of his death, but alſo maintained that ancient hypotheſis of a viſible and glorious church of CHRIST upon earth, that was peculiar to this ſect [k]. Thus a controverſy was kindled, which produced the diviſion now mentioned; a diviſion which the zealous efforts of ſeveral of the wiſeſt and moſt reſpectable members of this community have hitherto proved inſufficient to heal. The *Galeniſts* are not leſs diſpoſed than the Arminians to admit, as members of their community, all thoſe who call themſelves Chriſtians; and they are the only ſect of the Anabaptiſts who reject the denomination of Mennonites. The *Apoſtoolians*, on the contrary, admit to their communion thoſe only who profeſs to believe all the points of doctrine which are contained in their public confeſſion of faith [l].

---

[k] For a more particular account of theſe two Mennonites, ſee SCHYN's *Deductio plenior Hiſtor. Mennonit.* cap. xv. p. 318. and xviii. p. 237.

[l] CASP. COMMELINI *Deſcriptio Urbis Amſtelodami*, tom. i. p. 500.—STOUPA's *Religion des Hollandois*, p. 20.—BENTHEM's *Hollandiſcher Schulund Kirchen-Staat*, p. i. ch. xix. p. 830.

CHAP. VI.

Concerning the SOCINIANS *and* ARIANS.

The flouriſhing ſtate of the Socinians.

I. ABOUT the commencement of this century, the Sect of the Socinians ſeemed to be well eſtabliſhed, and their affairs were even in a flouriſhing ſituation. In *Tranſylvania* and *Lucko* they enjoyed the liberty of holding, without moleſtation, their religious aſſemblies, and profeſſing publicly their theological opinions. The advantages that attended their ſituation in *Poland* were ſtill more conſiderable; for they had at *Racow* a public ſeminary of learning, which was furniſhed with profeſſors eminently diſtinguiſhed by their erudition and genius, together with a preſs for the publication of their writings; they had alſo a conſiderable number of congregations in that diſtrict, and were ſupported by the patronage of ſeveral perſons of the higheſt diſtinction. Elated with this ſcene of proſperity, they began to form more extenſive views, and aimed at enlarging the borders of their community, and procuring it patrons and protectors in other countries. There are in being authentic records, from which it appears, that they ſent emiſſaries with this view, about the commencement of this century, into *Holland*, *England*, *Germany*, and *Pruſſia*, who endeavoured to make proſelytes to Socinianiſm in theſe countries, among men of learning and men in power. For it is remarkable, that the Socinians, in propagating their religious principles, have always followed a quite different method from that which has been obſerved by other ſects. It has been the general practice of ſectaries and innovators to endeavour to render themſelves popular, and to begin by gaining the multitude to their ſide; but the diſciples of SOCINUS, who are perpetually exalting the dignity, prerogatives, and authority of reaſon, have this peculiarity in their manner of proceeding, that they are at very little pains to court the favour of the people, or to make proſelytes to their cauſe among thoſe who are not diſtinguiſhed from the multitude by their rank or their abilities. It is only among the learned and the great that they ſeek for diſciples and patrons with a zealous aſſiduity.

The progreſs and decline of Socinianiſm at *Altorf.*

II. The effect of the miſſions now mentioned, though they were conducted and executed by perſons of whom the greateſt part were eminent, both on account of their rank and abilities, was nevertheleſs far from anſwering the views and expectations of the community. In moſt places their ſucceſs was doubtful, at beſt but inconſiderable; in ſome, however, they were favourably received, and ſeemed to employ their labours to purpoſe. They had no where a more flattering proſpect of ſucceſs than in the academy of *Altorf*, where their ſentiments and their cauſe were promoted with dexterity by ERNEST SOHNER, an acute and learned peripatetician, who was profeſſor of phyſic and natural philoſophy. This ſubtile philoſopher, who had joined the Socinians during his reſidence in *Holland*, inſtilled their principles into the minds of his ſcholars with much greater facility, by his having acquired the higheſt reputation both for learning and piety. The death, indeed, of this eminent man, which happened in the year 1612, deprived the riſing ſociety of its chief ornament and ſupport; nor could the remaining friends of Socinianiſm carry on the cauſe of their community with ſuch art and dexterity, as to eſcape the vigilant and ſevere eye of the other profeſſors. Their ſecret deſigns were accordingly brought to light in the year 1616; and the contagion of Socinianiſm, which was gathering ſtrength from day to day,

and

and growing imperceptibly into a reigning ſyſtem, was all of a ſudden diſſipated and extinguiſhed by the vigilant ſeverity of the magiſtrates of *Nuremberg*. The foreign ſtudents, who had been infected with theſe doctrines, ſaved themſelves by flight; while the natives, who were chargeable with the ſame reproach, accepted of the remedies that were preſented to them by the healing hand of orthodoxy, and returned quietly to their former theological ſyſtem [*m*].

The decline of Socinianiſm, and the ſufferings of its votaries in *Poland*.

III. The eſtabliſhment of the Socinians in *Poland*, though it ſeemed to reſt upon ſolid foundations, was nevertheleſs of a ſhort duration [*n*]. Its chief ſupports were withdrawn in the year 1638, by a public decree of the diet. It happened in this year that ſome of the ſtudents of *Racow* vented, in an irregular and tumultuous manner, their religious reſentment againſt a crucifix, at which they threw ſtones, till they beat it down out of its place. This act of violence excited ſuch a high degree of indignation in the Roman Catholics, that they vowed revenge, and fulfilled this vow in the ſevereſt manner; for it was through their importunate ſolicitations that the terrible law was enacted at *Warſaw*, by which it was reſolved, that the academy of *Racow* ſhould be demoliſhed, its profeſſors baniſhed with ignominy, the printing-houſe of the Socinians deſtroyed, and their churches ſhut. All this was executed without the ſmalleſt alleviation or the leaſt delay, notwithſtanding the efforts made by the powerful patrons of the Socinians to ward off the blow [*o*]. But a cataſtrophe, ſtill more terrible, awaited them; and the perſecution now mentioned was the forerunner of that dreadful revolution, which, about twenty years afterwards, brought on the entire ruin of this community in *Poland*: For by a public and ſolemn act of the diet held at *Warſaw*, in the year 1658, all the Socinians were baniſhed for ever from the territory of that republic, and capital puniſhment was denounced againſt all thoſe who ſhould either profeſs their opinions, or harbour their perſons. The unhappy exiles were, at firſt, allowed the ſpace of three years to ſettle their affairs, and to diſpoſe of their poſſeſſions; but this term was afterwards abridged by the cruelty of their enemies, and reduced to two years. In the year 1661, the terrible edict was renewed; and all the Socinians that yet remained in *Poland* were barbarouſly driven out of that country, ſome with the loſs of their goods, others with the loſs of their lives, as neither ſickneſs, nor any domeſtic conſideration, could ſuſpend the execution of that rigorous ſentence [*p*].

[*m*] The learned GUSTAVUS GEORGE ZELTNER, formerly profeſſor of divinity in the academy of *Altorf*, compoſed an ample and learned account of this theological revolution, drawn principally from manuſcript-records, which was publiſhed at *Leipſic*, in the year 1729, in two volumes, in 4to. by GEBAUER, under the following title: *Hiſtoria Crypto-Socinianiſmi, Altorfinæ quondam Academiæ infeſti, arcana.*

[*n*] We have a circumſtantial account of the flouriſhing ſtate of the Racovian academy, while it was under the direction of the learned MARTIN RUARUS, in the *Cimbria Litterata* of MOLLERUS, tom. i. p. 572. where we learn that RUARUS was a native of *Holſtein*, who became a proſelyte to the Socinian ſyſtem.

The fate of the Socinian exiles.

IV. A part of theſe exiles, who ſought for a refuge among their Brethren in *Tranſylvania*, ſunk under the burthen of their calamities, and periſhed amidſt the hardſhips to which they were expoſed,

---

[*o*] *Epiſtola de* WISSOWATII *vita in* SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar.* p. 233.—GUST. GEORG. ZELTNERI *Hiſtoria Crypto-Socinianiſmi Altorfini*, vol. i. p. 299.

[*p*] STANISLAI LUBIENIECII *Hiſtoria Reformat. Polonicæ*, lib. iii. c. xvii, xviii. p. 279.—*Equites Poloni Vindiciæ pro Unitariorum in Polonia Religionis libertate* apud SANDIUM, *in Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar.* p. 267.

CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART II.

expoſed. A conſiderable number of theſe unhappy emigrants were diſperſed through the adjacent provinces of *Sileſia*, *Brandenburg*, and *Pruſſia*; and their poſterity ſtill ſubſiſts in thoſe countries. Several of the more eminent members of the ſect, in conſequence of the protection granted them by the duke of Brieg, reſided for ſome time at *Croſſen*, in *Sileſia* [q]. Others went in ſearch of a convenient ſettlement for themſelves and their brethren, into *Holland*, *England*, *Holſtein*, and *Denmark*. Of all the Socinian exiles, none diſcovered ſuch zeal and induſtry for the intereſts and eſtabliſhment of the ſect as Stanislaus Lubieniecius, a Poliſh knight, diſtinguiſhed by his learning, and ſingularly eſteemed by perſons of the higheſt rank, and even by ſeveral ſovereign princes, on account of his eloquence, politeneſs, and prudence. This illuſtrious patron of Socinianiſm ſucceeded ſo far in his deſigns, as to gain the favour of Frederic III., king of *Denmark*; Christian Albert, duke of *Holſtein*; and Charles Lewis, elector *Palatine*; and thus had almoſt obtained a ſecure retreat and ſettlement for the Socinians, about the year 1662, at *Altena*, *Fredericſtadt*, and *Manheim*; but his meaſures were diſconcerted, and all his hopes entirely fruſtrated, by the oppoſition and remonſtrances of the clergy eſtabliſhed in theſe countries; he was oppoſed in *Denmark* by Suaningius biſhop of *Zealand*, in *Holſtein* by Reinboth, and in the *Palatinate* by John Lewis Fabricius [r]. Several other attempts were made, in different countries, in favour of Socinianiſm; but their ſucceſs was ſtill leſs conſiderable; nor could any of the European nations be perſuaded to grant a public ſettlement to a ſect, whoſe members denied the divinity of CHRIST.

---

[q] Lubieniecii *Hiſtoria Reformat. Polon.* cap. xviii. p. 285. where there is a letter written by the Socinians of *Croſſen*.

[r] See Sandii, *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitar.* p. 165.—*Hiſtoria Vitæ* Lubieniecii, prefixed to his *Hiſtoria Reformationis Polonicæ*, p. 7, 8.—Molleri *Introductio in Hiſtor. Cherſoneſ. Cimbricæ*, p. ii. p. 105. and his *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 487.—Jo. Henr. Heideggeri *Vita* Joh. Lud. Fabricii, ſubjoined to the works of the latter, p. 38.

V. The remains, therefore, of this unfortunate community are, at this day, diſperſed through different countries, particularly in the kingdoms of *England* and *Pruſſia*, the electorate of *Brandenburg*, and the *United Provinces*, where they lie more or leſs concealed, and hold their religious aſſemblies in a clandeſtine manner. They are, indeed, ſaid to exerciſe their religion publicly in *England* [rr], not in conſequence of a legal toleration,

---

☞ [rr] The *Socinians* in *England* have never made any figure as a *Community*, but have rather been diſperſed among that great variety of ſects that have ariſen in a country where Liberty diſplays its moſt glorious fruits, and at the ſame time exhibits its moſt ſtriking inconveniencies. Beſides, few eccleſiaſtics, or writers of any note, have adopted the theological ſyſtem now under conſideration, in all its branches. The Socinian doctrine relating to the deſign and efficacy of the death of Chriſt had indeed many abettors in *England* during the XVIIth century; and it may be preſumed, without temerity, that its votaries are rather increaſed than diminiſhed in the preſent; but thoſe divines who have abandoned the *Athanaſian* hypotheſis concerning the *Trinity of Perſons in the Godhead*, have more generally gone into the Arian and Semi-Arian notions of that inexplicable ſubject, than into thoſe of the Socinians, who deny that JESUS CHRIST exiſted before his appearance in the human nature. The famous JOHN BIDDLE, after having maintained both in public and in private during the reign of CHARLES, and the protectorſhip of CROMWELL, the *Unitarian* ſyſtem, erected an independent congregation in *London*, which is the only Britiſh church we have heard of, in which all the peculiar doctrines of Socinianiſm were inculcated; for, if we may give credit to the account of SIR PETER PETT, this congregation held the following notions: "That "the fathers under the old covenant had only temporal pro-"miſes—that ſaving faith conſiſted in univerſal obedience "performed to the commands of God and Chriſt;—that "Chriſt aroſe again only by the power of the Father, and not "his own;—that *juſtifying faith* is not the pure gift of God, "but, tion, but through the indulgent connivance of the civil magiſtrate [s]. Some of them have embraced the communion of the Arminians; others have joined with that ſect of the Anabaptiſts that are diſtinguiſhed by the name of *Galeniſts*; and in this there is nothing at all ſurpriſing, ſince neither the Arminians nor Anabaptiſts require from thoſe that enter into their communion an explicit or circumſtantial declaration of their religious ſentiments. It is alſo ſaid, that a conſiderable number of this diſperſed community became members of the religious ſociety called *Collegiants* [t]. Amidſt theſe perpetual changes

---

“ but may be acquired by men's natural abilities;—that *faith* cannot believe any thing contrary to, or above reaſon;—that there is no *original ſin*;—that Chriſt hath not the *ſame* body now in glory, in which he ſuffered and roſe again;—that the ſaints ſhall not have the *ſame* body in heaven which they had on earth;—that Chriſt was not *Lord* or *King* before his reſurrection, or *Prieſt* before his aſcenſion;—that the ſaints ſhall not, before the Day of Judgment, enjoy the bliſs of heaven;—that God doth not certainly know future contingencies;—that there is not any authority of fathers or general councils in determining matters of faith;—that Chriſt, before his death, had not any dominion over the Angels;—and that Chriſt, by dying, made not ſatisfaction for us.” See the *Preface* to Sir PETER PETT's *Happy future State of England*, printed at *London* in 1688.

[s] The Socinians, who reſide at preſent in the diſtrict of *Mark*, uſed to meet, ſome years ago, at ſtated times, at *Koningſwald*, a village in the neighbourhood of *Frankfort* on the *Oder*. See the *Recueil de Litterature, de Philoſophie et d'Hiſtoire* (publiſhed at *Amſterdam* in the year 1731, in 8vo *), p. 44.—They publiſhed, in the year 1716, at *Berlin*, their Confeſſion of Faith in the German language, which is to be found, with a refutation thereto annexed, in a book, intitled, *Den Theologiſchen Heb. Opfern.* part x. p. 852.

☞ [t] This community, of which there is an account given in the beginning of the following chapter, called their religious meetings *Collegies*, a Dutch word, which ſignifies congregation or aſſembly, and hence they were denominated *Collegiants*.

☞ * The author of this collection was one JORDAN, who was paſtor of a church in the neighbourhood of *Berlin*.

and viciſſitudes, it was not poſſible that the Socinians could maintain an uniform ſyſtem of doctrine, or preſerve unaltered and entire the religious tenets handed down to them by their anceſtors. On the contrary, their peculiar and diſtinctive opinions are variouſly explained and underſtood both by the learned and illiterate members of their community, though they all agree in rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity, and that alſo of the *divinity* and *ſatisfaction* of JESUS CHRIST [u].

Arians.

VI. After the Socinians, as there is a great affinity between the two ſects, it is proper to mention the Arians, who had ſeveral celebrated writers in this century, ſuch as SANDIUS and BIDDLE [w]. Of thoſe who alſo paſſed under the general denomination of *Anti-Trinitarians* and *Unitarians* there are many that may be placed in the claſs of the Socinians and Arians: for the term *Unitarian* is very comprehenſive, and is applicable to a great variety of perſons, who, notwithſtanding, agree in this common principle, that *there is no real diſtinction in the divine nature.* The denomination of Arian is alſo given in general to all who conſider JESUS CHRIST as *inferior* and *ſubordinate* to the Father. But as this ſubordination may be underſtood and explained in a variety of ways, it is evident, that the term *Arian*, as it is uſed in modern language, is ſuſceptible of different ſignifications; and that of conſequence the perſons to whom it is applied cannot be all conſidered in the ſame point of light with the ancient Arians, nor ſuppoſed to agree perfectly with each other in their religious tenets.

---

[u] Many examples might be alleged in proof of this; it will be ſufficient to mention that of the learned CRELLIUS, who, though he was profeſſor of theology among the Socinians, yet differed in his opinions, about many points of doctrine, from the ſentiments of SOCINUS and the Racovian Catechiſm, and would not be called a Socinian, but an *Artemonite* *. See the *Journal Litteraire*, tom. xvii. p. i. p. 150. and the account I have given of this celebrated man in my *Syntagm. Diſſertationum ad ſanctiores Diſciplinas pertinentium*, p. 352.—*Unſchuld. Nachricht.* 1750. p. 942.—*Nouveau Diction. Hiſtorique et Critique*, tom. ii. p. ii. p. 88. ☞ This laſt citation is erroneous; there is no account of CRELLIUS in the place here referred to.

[w] For an account of SANDIUS, father and ſon, ſee ARNOLD and other writers. The Life of BIDDLE is to be found in the *Nouveau Diction. Hiſtorique et Critique*, tom. i. p. ii. p. 288. ☞ Dr. MOSHEIM places BIDDLE improperly among the *Arians*; it is manifeſt that he belongs to the *Socinians*, ſince, in the IIId article of his Confeſſion of Faith, he profeſſeth to believe that *Chriſt has no other than a human nature*. See the *Socinian Tracts*, intitled, *The Faith of one God*, &c. publiſhed at *London* in 4to, in 1691. See alſo above, *note* [rr].

☞ * After ARTEMON, who lived under the reign of the Emperor SEVERUS, and denied the pre-exiſtence and divinity of JESUS CHRIST.

CHAP. VII.

Concerning ſome Sects of Inferior Note.

The Collegiants or Rhinſbergers.

I. IT will not be amiſs to take notice here of a few ſects of inferior conſequence and note, which we could not mention with propriety in the hiſtory of the larger and more extenſive communities that we have been paſſing in review, and which, nevertheleſs, we cannot omit, for ſeveral reaſons. While the diſputes and tumults that the Arminian ſyſtem produced in *Holland*, in the year 1619, were at the greateſt height, then aroſe that religious ſociety, whoſe members hold at *Rhinſberg*, in the neighbourhood of *Leyden*, a ſolemn aſſembly every half year, and are generally known under the denomination of *Collegiants* [x]. This community was founded by three brothers, whoſe name was VANDER KODDE, who paſſed their days in the obſcurity of a rural life, but are ſaid to have been men of eminent piety, well acquainted with ſacred literature, and great enemies to religious controverſy. They had for their aſſociate ANTHONY CORNELIUS, a man alſo of a mean condition, and who had no qualities that could give any degree of weight or credit to their cauſe. The deſcendants and followers of theſe men acquired the name of *Collegiants* from this particular circumſtance, that they called their religious aſſemblies *Colleges*. All are admitted to the communion of this ſect who acknowledge the divinity of the holy Scriptures, and endeavour to live ſuitably to their precepts and doctrines, whatever their peculiar ſentiments may be concerning the nature of the Diety, and the truths of Chriſtianity. Their numbers are very conſiderable in the provinces of *Holland*, *Utrecht*, *Frieſland*, and *Weſtfrieſland*. They meet twice every week, namely on Sundays and Wedneſdays, for the purpoſes of divine worſhip; and after ſinging a pſalm or hymn, and addreſſing themſelves to the Diety by prayer, they explain a certain portion of the New Teſtament. The female members of the community are not allowed to ſpeak in public; but all others, without any exception founded on rank, condition, or incapacity, have a right to communicate the reſult of their meditations to the aſſembly, and to ſubmit their ſentiments to the judgment of the Brethren. All likewiſe have an unqueſtionable right to examine and oppoſe what any of the Brethren has advanced, provided their oppoſition be attended with a ſpirit of Chriſtian charity and moderation.

---

[x] See above, note [t].

There is a printed liſt of the paſſages of Scripture, that are to be examined and illuſtrated at each of their religious meetings; ſo that any one who is ambitious of appearing among the *ſpeakers*, may ſtudy the ſubject before-hand, and thus come fully prepared to deſcant upon it in public. The Brethren, as has been already obſerved, have a general aſſembly twice a year at *Rhinſberg*, where they have ample and convenient houſes for the education of orphans and the reception of ſtrangers; and there they remain together during the ſpace of four days, which are employed in hearing diſcourſes that tend to edification, and exhortations that are principally deſigned to inculcate brotherly love and ſanctity of manners. The ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper is alſo adminiſtered during this aſſembly; and thoſe adult perſons, that deſire to be baptized, receive the ſacrament of Baptiſm, according to the ancient and primitive manner of celebrating that inſtitution, even by immerſion. Thoſe of the Brethren that reſide in the province of *Frieſland*, have at preſent an annual meeting at *Lewarden*, where they adminiſter the ſacraments, as the conſiderable diſtance at which they live from *Rhinſberg* renders it inconvenient for them to repair thither twice a year. We ſhall conclude our account of the *Collegiants* by obſerving, that their community is of a moſt ample and extenſive kind; that it comprehends perſons of all ranks, orders, and ſects, who profeſs themſelves Chriſtians, though their ſentiments concerning the perſon and doctrine of the divine founder of Chriſtianity be extremely different; that it is kept together, and its union maintained, not by the authority of rulers and doctors, the force of eccleſiaſtical laws, the reſtraining power of creeds and confeſſions, or the influence of certain poſitive rites and inſtitutions, but merely by a zeal for the advancement of practical religion, and a deſire of drawing inſtruction from the ſtudy of the Holy Scriptures [y].

II. In ſuch a community, or rather amidſt ſuch a multitude as this, in which *opinion* is free, and every one is permitted to judge for himſelf in religious matters, diſſenſions and controverſies can ſcarcely have place. However a debate, attended with ſome warmth, aroſe, in the year 1672, between JOHN and PAUL BREDENBURG, merchants of *Rotterdam*, on the one ſide, and ABRAHAM LEMMERMAN and FRANCIS CUIPER, merchants of *Amſterdam*, on the other. JOHN BREDENBURG had erected a particular ſociety, or *college*, in which he gave a courſe of lectures upon the religion of nature and reaſon; but this undertaking was highly diſapproved of by LEMMERMAN and CUIPER, who were for excluding reaſon altogether from religious inquiries and purſuits. During the heat of this controverſy, BREDENBURG diſcovered a manifeſt propenſity towards the ſentiments of SPINOZA; nay; he even defended them publicly, and yet, at the ſame time, profeſſed a firm attachment to the Chriſtian religion [z]. Other debates of leſs conſequence aroſe in this community, and

the

---

[y] See the *Diſſertation ſur les uſages de ceux qu'on appelle en Hollande Colligiens et Rhinobourgeois*, in the *Ceremonies Religieuſes des tous les Peuples du Monde*, tom. iv. p. 323.—as alſo a Dutch book, containing an account of the *Collegiants*, and publiſhed by themſelves under the following title: *De Oerſpronck, Natuur, Handelwyz en Oogmerk der zo genaamde Rynburgſche Vergadering*, at *Amſterdam*, in 4to. in the year 1736.

[z] The names of JOHN BREDENBURG and FRANCIS CUIPER are well known among the followers and adverſaries of SPINOZA; but the character and profeſſion of theſe two diſputants are leſs generally known. BREDENBURG, or (as he is otherwiſe called) BREITENBURG, was a *Collegiant*, and a merchant of *Rotterdam*, who propagated in a public manner the doctrine of SPINOZA, and pretended to demon-

ſtrate

the effect of thoſe diſſenſions was a diviſion of the *Collegiants* into two parties, which held their aſſemblies ſeparately at *Rhinſberg*. This diviſion happened in the year 1686, but it was healed about the commencement of the preſent century, by the death of thoſe who had principally occaſioned it; and then the *Collegiants* returned to their former union and concord [a].

III. The

ſtrate mathematically its conformity to the dictates of reaſon. The ſame man not only profeſſed Chriſtianity, but moreover explained, recommended, and maintained, the Chriſtian religion in the meetings of the *Collegiants*, and aſſerted, on all occaſions, its divine original. To reconcile theſe ſtriking contradictions, he declared, on the one hand, that *reaſon* and *Chriſtianity* were in direct oppoſition to each other; but maintained, on the other, that we were obliged to believe, even againſt the evidence of the ſtrongeſt mathematical demonſtrations, the religious doctrines comprehended in the Holy Scriptures (this, indeed, was adding abſurdity to abſurdity). He affirmed, that *truth* was twofold, *theological* and *philoſophical*; and that thoſe propoſitions, which were falſe in theology, were true in philoſophy. There is a brief, but accurate account, of the character and ſentiments of BREDENBURG, in the learned work of the Jew, ISAAC OROBIO, intitled, *Certamen Philoſophicum propugnatæ veritatis divinæ et naturalis adverſus* JO. BREDENBURGII *principia, ex quibus, quod religio rationi repugnat, demonſtrare nititur*. This work, which contains BREDENBURG's pretended demonſtrations of the philoſophy of SPINOZA, was firſt publiſhed in 8vo at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1703, and afterwards in 12mo at *Bruſſels*, in 1731. FRANCIS CUIPER, who was the antagoniſt of BREDENBURG, acquired a conſiderable reputation by his *Arcana Atheiſmi detecta*, i. e. *The Secrets of Atheiſm detected*. He was a bookſeller at *Amſterdam*; and it was he that publiſhed, among other things, the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum ſeu Unitariorum*. Thoſe who have a tolerable acquaintance with the literary hiſtory of this century, know that CUIPER, on account of the very book which he wrote againſt BREDENBURG, was ſuſpected of Spinoziſm, though he was a *Collegiant*, and a zealous defender of the Chriſtian faith, as alſo of the perfect conformity that there is between right reaſon and true religion. ☞ Dr. MOSHEIM ſaid a little before, in the text, that LEMMERMAN and CUIPER were for excluding reaſon altogether from religion; how then can he conſiſtently ſay here of the latter, that he was a *defender of the conformity that there is between reaſon and religion?*

[a] Beſides the authors who have been already mentioned

thoſe

The Labbadiſts.

III. The ſect of the *Labbadiſts* were ſo called from their founder JOHN LABBADIE, a native of *France*, a man of no mean genius, and remarkable for a natural and maſculine eloquence. This man was born in the Romiſh communion, entered into the order of the Jeſuits, and, being diſmiſſed by them [b], became a member of the Reformed church, and performed, with reputation, the miniſterial functions in *France*, *Switzerland*; and *Holland*. He at length erected a new community, which reſided ſucceſſively at *Middleburgh* in *Zealand* and at *Amſterdam*. In the year 1670; it was tranſplanted to *Hervorden*, a town in *Weſtphalia*; at the particular deſire of the Princeſs ELIZABETH, daughter of the elector *Palatine*, and abbeſs of *Hervorden* [c]. It was nevertheleſs driven from thence, notwithſtanding the protection of this illuſtrious princeſs; and, in the year

---

thoſe who underſtand the German language may conſult the curious work of SIMON FREDERIC RUES, intitled, *Nachrichten vom Zuſtande der Mennoniten*, p. 267.

☞ [b] From this expreſſion of our author, ſome may be led to imagine, that LABBADIE was expelled by the Jeſuits from their ſociety; and many have, in effect, entertained this notion. But this is a palpable miſtake; and whoever will be at the pains of conſulting the letter of the Abbé GOUJET to Father NICERON (publiſhed in the *Memoires des Hommes illuſtres*, tom. xx. p. 142, 143.) will find that LABBADIE had long ſolicited his diſcharge from that ſociety, and, after many refuſals, obtained it at length in an honourable manner, by a public act ſigned at *Bourdeaux*, by one of the provincials, the 17th of April 1639. For a full account of this reſtleſs, turbulent, and viſionary man, who, by his plans of reformation, conducted by a zeal deſtitute of prudence, produced much tumult and diſorder, both in the Romiſh and reformed churches, ſee his *Life*, compoſed with learning, impartiality, and judgment, by the Rev. Mr CHAUFFEPIED, in his Supplement to Mr BAYLE, intitled, *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hiſtorique et Critique*.

☞ [c] This illuſtrious princeſs ſeems to have had as prevailing a taſte for fanaticiſm, as her grandfather King JAMES I. of *England* had for ſcholaſtic theology. She carried on a correſpondence year 1672, ſettled at *Altena*, where its founder died two years after his arrival. After the death of LABBADIE, his followers removed their wandering community to *Wiewert*, in the diſtrict of *North Holland*, where it found a peaceful retreat, and ſoon fell into oblivion; ſo that few, if any traces of it, are now to be found.

Among the perſons that became members of this ſect, there were ſome, whoſe learning and abilities gave it a certain degree of credit and reputation, particularly ANNA MARIA SCHURMAN, of *Utrecht*, whoſe extenſive erudition rendered her ſo famous, in the republic of letters, during the laſt century. The members of this community, if we are to judge of them by their own account of things, did not differ from the Reformed church ſo much in their tenets and doctrines, as in their manners and rules of diſcipline [*d*]; for their founder exhibited, in his own conduct, a moſt

---

correſpondence with PENN, the famous Quaker, and other members of that extravagant ſect. She is, nevertheleſs, celebrated by certain writers, on account of her application to the ſtudy of philoſophy and poetry. That a poetical fancy may have rendered her ſuſceptible of fanatical impreſſions, is not impoſſible; but how theſe impreſſions could be reconciled with a philoſophical ſpirit, is more difficult to imagine.

☞ [*d*] LABBADIE always declared, that he embraced the doctrines of the Reformed church. Nevertheleſs, when he was called to perform the miniſterial functions to a French church at *Middleburgh* in *Zealand*, he refuſed to ſubſcribe their confeſſion of faith. Beſides, if we examine his writings, we ſhall find that he entertained very odd and ſingular opinions on various ſubjects. He maintained, among other things, "that God might, and did, on certain occaſions, de-
" ceive men—that the Holy Scripture was not ſufficient to
" lead men to ſalvation, without certain particular *illumina-*
" *tions* and *revelations* from the Holy Ghoſt—that in reading
" the Scriptures we ought to give leſs attention to the literal
" ſenſe of the words than to the inward ſuggeſtions of the
" ſpirit, and that the efficacy of the word depended upon
" him that preached it—that the faithful ought to have all
" things in common—that there is no ſubordination or di-
" ſtinction

a moſt auſtere model of ſanctity and obedience, which his diſciples and followers were obliged to imitate; and they were taught to look for the *communion of ſaints*, not only in the inviſible church, but alſo in a *viſible* one, which, according to their views of things, ought to be compoſed of none but ſuch perſons as were diſtinguiſhed by their ſanctity and virtue, and by a pious progreſs towards perfection. There are ſtill extant ſeveral treatiſes compoſed by LABBADIE, which ſufficiently diſcover the temper and ſpirit of the man, and carry the evident marks

---

“ ſtinction of rank in the true church of CHRIST—that “ CHRIST was to reign a thouſand years upon earth—that “ the *contemplative life* is a ſtate of grace and union with “ God, and the very height of perfection—that the Chriſtian, “ whoſe mind is contented and calm, ſees all things in God, “ enjoys the Deity, and is perfectly indifferent about every “ thing that paſſes in the world—and that the Chriſtian arrives “ at that happy ſtate by the exerciſe of a perfect ſelf-denial, “ by mortifying the fleſh and all ſenſual affections, and by “ mental prayer.” Beſides theſe, he had formed ſingular ideas of the Old and New Teſtament, conſidered as covenants, as alſo concerning the Sabbath and the true nature of a Chriſtian church.

It is remarkable enough, that almoſt all the ſectaries of an enthuſiaſtical turn, were deſirous of entering into communion with LABBADIE. The Browniſts offered him their church at *Middleburg*, when he was ſuſpended by the French ſynod from his paſtoral functions. The Quakers ſent their two leading members ROBERT BARCLAY and GEORGE KEITH to *Amſterdam*, while he reſided there, to examine his doctrine; and, after ſeveral conferences with him, theſe two commiſſioners offered to receive him into their communion, which he refuſed, probably from a principle of ambition, and the deſire of remaining head of a ſect. Nay, it is ſaid, that the famous WILLIAM PENN made a ſecond attempt to gain over the Labbadiſts; and that he went for that purpoſe to *Wiewert*, where they reſided after the death of their founder, but without ſucceſs. We do not pretend to anſwer for the certainty of theſe facts; but ſhall only obſerve, that they are related by MOLLERUS in his *Cimbria Literata*, on the authority of a MS. Journal, of which ſeveral extracts have been given by JOACH. FRED. FELLER, in his *Trimeſt.* IX *Monumentorum ineditorum*, ſect. iii. A. 1717. p. 498—500.

of a lively and glowing imagination, that was not tempered by the influence of a ſober and accurate judgment. And as perſons of this character are ſometimes carried, by the impetuoſity of paſſion and the ſeduction of fancy, both into erroneous notions and licentious purſuits, we are not perhaps to reject, in conſequence of an exceſſive charity, the teſtimonies of thoſe who have found many things worthy of cenſure, both in the life and doctrine of this turbulent enthuſiaſt [e].

Bourignon and Poiret.

IV. Among the fanatical contemporaries of LABBADIE, was the famous ANTOINETTE BOURIGNON DE LA PORTE, a native of *Flanders*, who pretended to be divinely-inſpired, and ſet apart, by a particular interpoſition of Heaven, to revive the true ſpirit of Chriſtianity, that had been extinguiſhed by theological animoſities and debates. This female enthuſiaſt, whoſe religious feelings were accompanied with an unparalleled vivacity and ardor, and whoſe fancy was exuberant beyond all expreſſion, joined to theſe qualities a volubility of tongue, leſs wonderful indeed, yet much adapted to ſeduce the unwary. Furniſhed with theſe uſeful talents, ſhe began to propagate her theological ſyſtem, and her enthuſiaſtical notions made a great noiſe in *Flanders*, *Holland*, and ſome parts of *Germany*, where ſhe had reſided ſome years. Nor was it only the ignorant multitude that ſwallowed down with facility her viſionary doctrines; ſince it is well known that ſeveral learned and ingenious men were perſuaded of their truth, and caught the contagion of her fanaticiſm. After experiencing various turns of fortune, and ſuffering much vexation and mockeries on account of her religious fancies, ſhe ended her days at *Franeker*, in the province of *Frieſland*, in the year 1680. Her writings were voluminous; but it would be a fruitleſs attempt to endeavour to draw from them an accurate and conſiſtent ſcheme of religion. For the pretended *divine light*, that guides people of this claſs, does not proceed in a methodical way of reaſoning and argument; it diſcovers itſelf by flaſhes, which ſhed nothing but thick darkneſs in the minds of thoſe who inveſtigate truth with the underſtanding, and do not truſt to the reports of fancy, that is ſo often governed by ſenſe and paſſion. An attentive reader will, however, learn ſomething by peruſing the writings of this fanatical virgin; he will be perſuaded, that her intellect muſt have been in a diſordered ſtate; that the greateſt part of her *divine effuſions* were borrowed from the productions of the Myſtics; and that, by the intemperance of her imagination, ſhe has given an additional air of extravagance and abſurdity to the tenets ſhe has derived from theſe pompous enthuſiaſts. If we attend to the main and predominant principle that reigns throughout the incoherent productions of BOURIGNON, we ſhall find it to be the following: *That the Chriſtian religion neither conſiſts in knowledge nor in practice, but in a certain internal feeling and divine impulſe, that ariſes immediately from communion with the Deity* [*f*.] Among the more conſiderable patrons of this fana-

---

[e] See MOLLERUS's *Cimbria Literata*, tom. iii. p. 35. & *Iſagoge ad Hiſtor. Cherſoneſ. Cimbricæ*, p. ii. cap. v. p. 121.—ARNOLD, *Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſt.* vol. i. p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. xxi. p. 1186.—WEISMAN, *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Sæc.* xvii. p. 297.—For an account of the two famous companions of LABBADIE, *viz.* DU LIGNON and YVON, ſee MOLLERUS's *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 472. 1020.

[*f*] See for an ample account of BOURIGNON, the following writers: MOLLER. *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 85.—*Introductio in Hiſtor. Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ*, p. ii. p. 151.—BAYLE's *Dictionnaire*, tom. i. at the article BOURIGNON.—ARNOLD, *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. et Hæret*, vol. ii. ☞ See alſo POIRET's *Epiſt. de Auctoribus Myſticis*, ſect. xiv. p. 565. This treatiſe of POIRET is inſerted at the end of his book, *De Eruditione Solida & Superficiaria*, vol. ii. edit. 4to.

tical doctrine, we may reckon CHRISTIAN BARTHOLOMEW DE CORDT, a Janſeniſt, and prieſt of the oratory at *Mechlin*, who died at *Nordſtrandt*, in the dutchy of *Sleſwick* [g]; and PETER POIRET, a man of a bold and penetrating genius, who was a great maſter of the Carteſian philoſophy [h]. This latter has ſhewn, in a ſtriking manner, by his own example, that knowledge and ignorance, reaſon and ſuperſtition, are often divided by thin partitions; and that they ſometimes not only dwell together in the ſame perſon, but alſo, by an unnatural and unaccountable union, lend each other mutual aſſiſtance, and thus engender monſtrous productions.

The Philadelphian Society.

V. The ſame ſpirit, the ſame views, and the ſame kind of religion, that diſtinguiſhed BOURIGNON, were obſervable in an Engliſh, and alſo a female fanatic, named JANE LEADLEY, who, towards the concluſion of this century, ſeduced by her viſions, predictions, and doctrines, a conſiderable number of diſciples, among whom there were ſome perſons of learning; and thus gave riſe to what was called the *Philadelphian Society*. This woman was of opinion that all diſſenſions among Chriſtians would ceaſe, and the kingdom of the Redeemer become, even here below, a glorious ſcene of charity, concord, and felicity, if thoſe who bear the name of JESUS, without regarding the forms of doctrine or diſcipline that diſtinguiſh particular communions, would all join in committing their ſouls to the care of the

---

[g] MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 149.

[h] POIRET dreſſed out in an artful manner, and reduced to a kind of ſyſtem, the wild and incoherent fancies of BOURIGNON, in his large work, intitled, *L'Oeconomie Divine, ou Syſteme Univerſel*, which was publiſhed, both in French and Latin, at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1686, in ſeven volumes 8vo.— For an account of this Myſtic philoſopher, whoſe name and voluminous writings have made ſuch a noiſe, ſee *Bibliotheca Brem. Theolog. Philol.* tom. iii. p. i. p. 75.

internal guide, to be inſtructed, governed, and formed by his divine impulſe and ſuggeſtions. Nay, ſhe went ſtill further, and declared in the name of the Lord, that this deſirable event would happen; and that ſhe had a divine commiſſion to proclaim the approach of this glorious communion of ſaints, who were to be gathered together in one viſible univerſal church, or kingdom, before the diſſolution of this earthly globe. This prediction ſhe delivered with a peculiar degree of confidence, from a notion that her Philadelphian ſociety was the true *kingdom of* CHRIST, in which alone the divine ſpirit reſided and reigned. We ſhall not mention the other dreams of this enthuſiaſt, among which the famous doctrine of the final reſtoration of all intelligent Beings to perfection and happineſs held an eminent place. LEADLEY was leſs fortunate than BOURIGNON in this reſpect, that ſhe had not ſuch an eloquent and ingenious patron as POIRET to plead her cauſe, and to give an air of philoſophy to her wild reveries. For PORDAGE and BROMLEY, who were the chief of her aſſociates, had nothing to recommend them but their Myſtic piety and contemplative turn of mind. PORDAGE, more eſpecially, was ſo far deſtitute of the powers of elocution and reaſoning, that he even ſurpaſſed JACOB BOEHMEN, whom he admired, in obſcurity and nonſenſe; and, inſtead of imparting inſtruction to his readers, did no more than excite in them a ſtupid kind of awe by a high-ſounding jingle of pompous words [*i*].

[*i*] See JO. WOLF. JAEGERI *Hiſtoria Sacra et Civilis, Sæc.* xvii. *Decenn.* x. p. 90.—PETRI POIRETI *Bibliotheca Myſticor.* p. 161. 174. 283. 286.

END OF THE FIFTH VOLUME.

00110769

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 09 July, 2016